The Communist

20c AUGUST 1944

Copy A
SF-939
10-7-44

THE GREAT INVASION
A. LANDY

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION
ADAM LAPIN

THE ARMED STRUGGLE OF THE POLISH PEOPLE

THE TROTSKYITE FIFTH COLUMN IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT
GEORGE MORRIS

THOMAS' "SOCIALISTS" AID FASCISM
PAUL NOVICK

THE CUBAN ELECTIONS
BLAS ROCA

S.F.-939

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Three August Publications

MORALE EDUCATION IN THE AMERICAN ARMY

BY PHILIP FONER

In this new study, a distinguished American historian brings to light a wealth of material, including documents and speeches by Washington, Jackson and Lincoln, letters from soldiers, contemporary newspaper articles and editorials, resolutions and activities of workers' and other patriotic organizations backing up the fighting fronts, all skillfully woven together to make an illuminating analysis of the role of morale in the three great wars of American history—the War of Independence, the War of 1812, and the Civil War.

Price 20¢

MARX AND ENGELS ON REACTIONARY PRUSSIANISM

An important theoretical study which assembles the writings and opinions of Marx and Engels on the historical roots, character and reactionary political and military role of the Prussian Junkers, and illuminates the background of the plans for world domination hatched by the German general staff, the modern industrialists and the criminal Nazi clique.

Price 20¢

POLITICAL ECONOMY IN THE SOVIET UNION

Originally published in the Soviet periodical *Under the Banner of Marxism*, this article on the problems of teaching the subject in the Soviet Union stirred wide discussion in the United States after it was picked up and distorted by the New York *Times*. Because of the wide interest and demand, the article in its complete text and a verified translation are now being published in pamphlet form.

Price 15¢

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XXIII, No. 8 AUGUST, 1944

THE COMMUNIST

A MARXIST MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO ADVANCEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC THOUGHT AND ACTION

EARL BROWDER, Editor EUGENE DENNIS, Associate Editor

V. J. JEROME, Managing Editor

CONTENTS

The Great Invasion	*A. Landy*	675
Three Years of the Soviet Patriotic War		681
The Armed Struggle of the Polish People Against the Hitlerite Invaders		686
Resolution of the Union of Polish Patriots in the U.S.S.R.		694
The Republican Convention	*Adam Lapin*	696
Thomas' "Socialists" Aid Fascism	*Paul Novick*	705
The Trotskyite Fifth Column in the Labor Movement	*George Morris*	713
The Cuban Elections	*Blas Roca*	724
The Plan for Post-War Employment	*V. Gayev*	737
United Nations Monetary Policy	*Steve North*	745
"Talking Spokane" is "Talking Teheran"	*Robert Digby*	753
Resolutions Adopted by the National Convention, C.P.A		761

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published Monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. (mail address, P. O. Box 148, Station D), to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the War and the 1944 Elections

THE ROAD AHEAD, by Earl Browder ..... $.10

Speeches by the President of the Communist Political Association at its constituent convention.

IS DEWEY THE MAN?, by Sender Garlin ..... .05

An expose of the record of the G.O.P. presidential nominee, the forces backing him and their connections.

FOR A NEW AFRICA, by Paul Robeson, Max Yergen and others ..... .10

Proceedings of the recent conference of the Council on African Affairs, which throws light on Africa's role and potentialities in the post-war period.

WHAT DOES THE C.T.A.L. MEAN? by Vicente Lombardo Toledano ..... .10

The history, structure, role and program of the powerful Confederation of Latin American Workers, outlined by its president.

THE BALTIC SOVIET REPUBLICS, by Gregory Meiksins ..... .10

A survey of the history of the Baltic States, their role in the war, and perspectives following the defeat of the Hitlerite enemy, by the author of **The Baltic Riddle.**

SOVIET FARMS AND THE WAR, by Anna Louise Strong ..... .10

How Soviet agriculture met the stern test of the war as told by one of the foremost authorities on Soviet life and culture.

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GREAT INVASION

BY A. LANDY

IN THE long course of human history there have been outstanding, significant dates, world dates like 1492, 1648, 1776, 1789, 1917, which all mankind treasures as part of its common heritage. Future generations will continue to look back upon them with reverence as milestones in the progress of the human race. June 6, 1944, is one of those dates. For on that day the Anglo-American Allies launched their great invasion of Europe; the Teheran Agreement began to operate on the field of battle.

Throughout the world the invasion of France was greeted with unrestrained joy and thanksgiving. It was the long-awaited signal for the beginning of final liberation, the arrival of that full coalition warfare which would crush the "wounded German beast in its own lair." And the landing was a success; in fact, a great military achievement. For, in crossing the English Channel and landing troops in mass on the fortified beaches of Normandy, the Allies did what Hitler never dared to do, despite his repeated boasts and threats. Stalin expressed the tribute in the hearts of the entire anti-Hitler world when he declared that "the history of wars does not know any such undertaking so broad in conception and so grandiose in scale and so masterly in execution."

On June 11 the Red Army opened its great summer offensive in coordination with the Allied push from the West, launching a series of successive and unprecedented blows which began on the Karelian Isthmus against the Finns and quickly extended to the decisive Central Front, the gateway to the shortest route to Berlin. The Red Army had utilized the comparative lull following the end of its brilliant ten-month steady advance up to April 12 to prepare for this final and greatest offensive of the war. When it struck, it was with such irresistible power and impact and with such magnificent generalship that in less than three weeks the most impregnable fortifications of the enemy were crushed, close to 200,000 Nazis were killed or captured and Hitler's vaunted legions were sent fleeing in panic. In twenty-two days the Red Army advanced 265 miles on the White Russian front, cut the main railway linking Warsaw with the German forces in Latvia and Esthonia, and crossed the Niemen River to knock at the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gates of East Prussia, preparing to enter Germany itself for the first time in the war.

The Crisis of Hitlerism

Attacked from the east, west and south, the Nazis have been brought face to face with their greatest crisis in the war. In one short month their most powerful concentrations have been smashed and their vaunted Atlantic Wall breached. The "supreme test," as Lieut. Gen. Kurt Dittmar, Nazi military commentator, announced on July 11, had come. Their only hope for averting complete catastrophe is to gain time —time to find new military resources and, above all, time to try again to divide the Allies. But time is the last thing they will get from the Allies, who are determined to achieve complete victory in the shortest possible period.

It is true that the Anglo-American pace in Normandy has been much slower than that of the Red Army, which is waging simultaneous offensives along a 700-mile front. Nearly six weeks after D-Day the Allies, fighting on a 100-mile front and engaging about fifteen Nazi divisions, have been able to do no more than inch their way forward in an effort to establish a foothold for operations on a grand scale. But it is generally recognized that the Anglo-American Allies will take full advantage of the new possibilities created by the initial success of their landings, the extraordinary response of the French partisans and the brilliant Soviet victories to coordinate the tempo and scale of their action in the West with the rate and power of the Soviet advance. "Now that the Russian armies are pushing ahead on a broad front toward the Baltic states and East Prussia," the *Christian Science Monitor* correspondent at the Supreme Allied headquarters reported on July 13, "the time has come, it is felt, to coordinate most Allied attacks in the West with the Red Army's advances in the East so as to derive the fullest effect from joint blows at the German morale."

There are those, of course, who want us to believe that the Anglo-American advance cannot be accelerated. These are the people who continue to promote the illusion of great German power, while projecting the prospect that Soviet strength will give out. They speak for the defeatist circles here and in England who do not want the Anglo-American Allies to extend their offensive. This sort of propaganda must and will be categorically rejected. But this does not mean that the war is over. General Eisenhower's recent warning against over-optimism was fully justified; in fact, as early as last May, Stalin pointed out that the biggest struggle was still ahead and that the most difficult, though shortest, phase of this struggle would be in destroying the beast in his own lair.

There can be no doubt that the Nazis will fight up to the bitter end in the hope of snatching victory from defeat. Despite the disintegration of their Eastern front and their notable lack of strategic reserves, the Nazis will not restrict themselves to passive defense or forego

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the effort to regain the military initiative. Because of this, the Anglo-American Allies will see that nothing is allowed to weaken the principle of full coalition warfare. For the Nazis have now given up all hope of regaining the initiative on the Eastern front because the scope and power of the Soviet offensive have made this forever impossible. The Nazis see their best chance of achieving a time-gaining success in the West, and they see this precisely because the scale of Anglo-American operations there is as yet limited. This was the military significance of Lieutenant General Kurt Dittmar's recent declaration that the Western front was now the most decisive front of all, a declaration which otherwise aimed at obscuring the real significance of the Eastern front while hoping to encourage the Anglo-American Allies to proceed more cautiously.

But the Allies will deprive Hitler even of this possibility of scoring any time-gaining success against the Anglo-American forces in the West, and they will do it by completing the iron ring of coalition warfare which Acting Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson recently said will choke the Nazis to death.

This is the main lesson of the victories in the Soviet Union and Normandy, a lesson which the defeatists are anxious to obscure but which sincere supporters of the war correctly recognize. Analyzing the relation of the invasion to the Soviet victories, Lieutenant General Sir Douglas Brownrigg, a British military commentator, wrote: "Nothing illustrates better the interdependence of operations in France and Russia and the reason why German military writers have always expressed a dread of a war on two fronts." And the American military analyst Major George Fielding Eliot, estimating the direction of German military counter-efforts, declared: "What German strategy, bereft of a central reserve, cannot stand any longer is a war on two decisive fronts at once."

This is the kind of war the responsible authorities of England, the United States and the Soviet Union are conducting at the present time. As President Roosevelt stated on July 11 in his letter indicating his readiness to run for re-election, "To win this war wholeheartedly, unequivocally and as quickly as we can is our task of the first importance. To win this war in such a way that there be no further world wars in the foreseeable future is our second objective." That kind of war is full coalition warfare in the spirit of the Teheran Agreement.

Political Aftermath

Important as is the military significance of the invasion, equally important is its bearing on the political cohesion of the anti-Hitler coalition of England, the United States and the Soviet Union. What began to unfold on the beaches of Normandy on June 6 was the grand strategy of Washington, London and Moscow which had been concerted for the first time at the Teheran Conference. The political developments since then indicate the extent to which the Allies mean business.

The last day of June Secretary of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State Cordell Hull announced that the United States had broken off diplomatic relations with Finland as a puppet of Nazi Germany. Hitler's Finnish partners had speculated until the end on differences between the United States and the Soviet Union. They had utilized continued American recognition as "proof" with which to bludgeon their own population into accepting the myth tha they were fighting an independent war against alleged Soviet "aggression." They exploited Washington's misplaced patience and persistent hope that American influence might ultimately induce the Finnish rulers to withdraw from the war, and the only beneficiary was Hitler. England, the United States and the Soviet Union had cooperated in the past to facilitate Finland's withdrawal from the war. By breaking with the Finnish Government which rejected the generous Soviet terms and openly proclaimed its partnership with the Nazis, the United States served notice on Hitler and his puppets that the Grand Alliance would continue to consolidate itself in the further course of the war.

Another important indication of the further consolidation of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition was the decision of the United States to recognize the right of the French National Liberation Committee headed by de Gaulle to handle the civil administration in liberated areas of France. This decision, arrived at during a five-day visit by de Gaulle to the United States during the second week in July, eliminated much of the differences that existed between England and the United States on the question of France. While Washington's action did not constitute an outright recognition of the de Gaulle Provisional Government, it brought England, the United States and the Soviet Union closer to full agreement and a common policy on France.

A third development of highest importance for the harmonious functioning of the coalition, especially after victory over Hitler, also occurred at the beginning of July. That was the formation of a new Yugoslav Government combining the representatives of King Peter and the forces of Marshal Tito on a democratic platform of national liberation and struggle against Hitler. This amicable and constructive settlement, sponsored by England, the Soviet Union and the United States, not only strengthened the prospects and forces of anti-Hitler national unity in Yugoslavia, but eliminated a serious source of future disagreement among the members of the coalition. The formation of the new government is a highly significant barometer of the seriousness with which the signatories to the Teheran Agreement are proceeding to resolve the various political problems confronting them and the anti-Hitler nations. It shows their determination to guarantee the success of the Teheran accord with its perspectives of a peaceful, orderly and democratic development of the world.

Finally, the United Nations Monetary Conference in progress during July marked a further important

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

step in preparing the economic framework for the operation of the Grand Alliance in the post-war period. All these events are the expression in the political sphere of the same spirit and determination embodied in the invasion of France in the military sphere. Their significance has not been lost on Hitler and his friends.

The Defeatists Respond

In face of the impending catastrophe, the Nazis bluster and plead in one and the same breath. On the one hand, they threaten to drown Europe in blood; on the other hand they plead for a compromise peace with England and the United States against the Soviet Union. The whole world, Goebbels discovered in the middle of July, wants peace and calm, except the Bolsheviks! The Nazis know very well that they cannot break up the coalition. But the Nazis are desperate gamblers. The entire Nazi nightmare was a gamble, a wild and devastating adventure. Now they make one more frantic attempt; maybe the laws of chance will favor them this time! But it is not the laws of chance that are operating on the continent of Europe today. It is the inexorable law of coalition warfare, of superior military power and the armed wrath of the aroused peoples, and nothing will stop them from asserting themselves with all the elemental force of the outraged, tortured, mutilated and murdered victims of the Nazi dreams of world conquest. It is a measure of the irrational desperation of the Nazis that, in face of the opening of coalition warfare, the very event which assures the stability of the coalition, they can only repeat, with the senseless persistence of a worn-out record rotating in the same groove, the same refrain about the Bolshevik bogey which failed to prevent or disrupt the anti-Hitler coalition before June 6!

The Nazis, of course, are not just shooting in the dark. Whatever slender hopes they entertain for the success of their compromise-peace overtures are fed by their knowledge that there are powerful forces in England and the United States who are working to save them from complete defeat. Both the threats and the appeals of the Nazis are intended as ammunition for these appeasement and defeatist forces in their struggle for power to determine the nation's policy.

It is precisely at this moment, therefore, that the defeatists in England and the United States develop their greatest activity. With the hope of enduring success in the military field gone, the Nazis' remaining chance is in the political field—provided their friends are able to secure control of the government. In the United States, that chance might come in November, should the Hearst-McCormick crowd be swept into power with the election of the Dewey-Bricker Republican ticket. Their only fear is that the three-front war may develop at such a rate as to eliminate this possibility of aid in November. That is why the defeatist press speaks of the impossibility of accelerating the pace of the Anglo-American advance in France.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Hearst-McCormick forces behind Dewey and Bricker have openly advocated a compromise peace with Hitler. That is what they mean when they speak of "shortening" the war. They are opposed to the collaboration of England, the United States and the Soviet Union for victory in the war and the organization of the peace. The Teheran Agreement is anathema to them. Herbert Hoover, in his speech at the Republican Convention, talked generally of international collaboration, but condemned its realization in the Teheran accord. Hatred of the Commander-in-Chief and opposition to his policies are the main article of faith of the Republican election campaign. Should they get power in November, they would proceed to work for a world based on hostility to the Soviet Union, imperialist aggression and the preservation of fascist reaction throughout the globe. As Wendell Willkie declared in rejecting the G.O.P. foreign policy plank, the Republican platform provides for no international organization, no suppression of aggression, no peaceful world.

The outcome of the invasion will be decided on the field of battle. But the length of the war and the full realization of the Teheran Agreement will be affected by the conduct of the election campaign and the character and policies of the government elected in November. The President has provided the nation with a standard of judgment regarding victory in the war, and what is a standard for victory must be a standard in the elections. That standard is: to win the war wholeheartedly, unequivocally and as quickly as possible, and in such a way as to prevent future wars for generations to come and to provide security and jobs for all. The Republican leaders reject this standard. They are asking the nation to defeat the President in order to defeat these policies.

There can be no doubt of the decisive importance of backing up the invasion by uniting behind the President, defeating the enemies of the Commander-in-Chief and his policies now and in the November elections. For nothing less than the fate of the United States and the world is at stake. Not since 1864 have the people of the United States had such a grave responsibility and solemn duty in a presidential election.

The invasion of Europe opened the final stage of the war. The American people will give everything to bring the war to a speedy and victorious conclusion. That can only be done by standing solidly behind the Commander-in-Chief and the Government's policies for speedy victory and a durable peace. That, also, is the test of true patriotism today, in deeds as well as in words.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THREE YEARS OF THE SOVIET PATRIOTIC WAR *

THREE years have elapsed today since the German-fascist bandit gangs villainously attacked the Soviet Union. For three years the Soviet people have been courageously waging the Patriotic War against the insolent invaders. Since the first days of the war the peoples of our country unanimously arose in defense of their motherland.

In the heavy, sanguinary battles on the 3,000-kilometer front the Red Army has checked the German-fascist army of many million men supplied with up-to-date military equipment, and inflicted upon it tremendous losses in manpower and arms. The fascist war machine, which had swept with fire and sword over the towns and villages of ten European countries, missed fire in the battles against our Army.

In the very first year of the war the Red Army effected the slaughter of the Germans at Moscow and routed the enemy's picked shock troops. In the past one and one-half years, since the German-fascist troops were routed at Stalingrad, the enemy has not been able to recover. Soviet troops developed the offensive along the whole front, broke up the Germans' powerful defense systems at Stalingrad, Orel, Smolensk, Leningrad, on the Mius River and on the Dnieper, at Perekop and Sevastopol, on the Karelian Isthmus and the Svir River, and forced large water barriers — the Don, Severny Donets, Desna, Volkhov, Dnieper, Yuzhny Bug, Dniester, Prut, Seret, Narva and Svir — and thereby proved that all the walls and fortresses about which the Hitlerites prattled so much cannot hold out when the destruction and overcoming of these walls and fortresses are undertaken seriously by troops tried and steeled in battle.

Due to the able strategy of the Supreme Command, the well-considered and resolute tactics of Soviet generals and officers, the heroism and military skill of its soldiers and, lastly, due to its powerful war equipment, the Red Army has inflicted a number of grave defeats on the united picked armies of the Germans, Italians, Rumanians, Hungarians and Finns.

The great victories achieved by our troops at Moscow, Stalingrad and in the Caucasus, at Orel and Smolensk, at Leningrad and in the Donets Basin, on the Dnieper and in the Crimea, in the Ukraine west of the Dnieper, on the Dniester and in the Karelian Isthmus, will forever go down in history. During these offensive battles the Soviet troops

* A communiqué of the Soviet Information Bureau, issued June 22, 1944.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liberated about one and one-half million square kilometers of enemy-occupied territory, advanced nearly 2,000 kilometers to the west, reached our frontiers over a large stretch of the front and entered the territory of Rumania.

The victories of the Red Army have brought liberation from fascist bondage to millions of Soviet people. Our troops have deprived the Germans of their sources of industrial raw materials and food in occupied regions, while "living space" in the East, of which the Hitlerites had dreamed, has turned into graves for millions of German soldiers, a gigantic cemetery of fascist war equipment.

Soviet Guerrillas Aid Red Army

Tremendous assistance in the struggle against the German-fascist invaders has been rendered to the Red Army by gallant Soviet guerrillas. In the course of three years of war they continued to smash enemy rear establishments and headquarters, destroying his communications and telegraph and telephone lines, and ruthlessly exterminating the German-fascist scoundrels. The Soviet guerrillas saved many thousands of Soviet people from extermination and abduction to fascist slavery.

In three years of war the German-fascist troops have lost in fighting on the Soviet-German front over 7,800,000 officers and men killed or taken prisoner, up to 70,000 tanks, 60,000 aircraft and over 90,000 guns. During the same period the losses of our troops totaled 5,300,000 men killed, taken prisoner or missing, 49,000 tanks, 30,128 aircraft and 48,000 guns. Our Allies, the United States of America and Great Britain, have made considerable contributions to the successes of the Red Army by supplying us with very valuable strategical raw materials and armaments and by subjecting the military objectives of Germany to systematic bombardments, thereby undermining the latter's military might.

Thus, having frustrated Hitler's plans of a lightning war in the initial period of the Patriotic War, the Red Army in the subsequent period upset and buried the enemy's defensive strategy and his plans for the consolidation of captured Soviet territories. The German-fascist army has been beaten, and now faces utter defeat. Such is the military result of the past three years of the Patriotic War.

Friendship of Peoples of U.S.S.R.

When unleashing the war against the Soviet Union, the Hitlerite imperialists believed that the very first military reverses of the Red Army would undermine the confidence of the peoples of our country in their Government, would sow discord among peoples of the U.S.S.R. and would weaken the union of workers, peasants and intellectuals which forms the foundation of the Soviet State. In reality, however, wartime difficulties only served to rally the workers of the Soviet rear still closer, to render even stronger their union with their popular Soviet Government. The friendship of the peoples of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Union has gained strength and has grown tempered like steel in the progress of the Patriotic War. The union of workers, peasants and intellectuals is based on the vital interests of the working people of Soviet society, and has become still more stable.

The German fiends also calculated that Soviet industry would prove incapable of coping with the difficult tasks of the production of up-to-date arms on a mass scale, that our transport would prove incapable of coping with military transportation, and agriculture with the supply to the Army and the population of food and industrial raw materials. But these plans of the ill-starred German conquerors have burst like a soap bubble. It is the economy of Hitlerite Germany that has been exhausted as a result of three years of war, and not the economy of the Soviet Union. The defeats sustained by the Germans on the Soviet-German front, and the blows dealt by the Allied Air Force have undermined Germany's military-economic might.

At the same time the industry, transport and agriculture of the Soviet country have successfully passed the test of war. The Soviet people spares no strength for the defense of the motherland and is imbued with determination to protect the Soviet State, which it created, from all enemy encroachments. The Patriotic War has given rise to an unprecedented surge of patriotic feeling of the peoples, and to an inexhaustive creative energy of the masses of the people aimed at rendering support to the Red Army.

At present, on the threshold of the fourth year of the war, the Soviet Union possesses a powerful war economy which meets the requirements of the Red Army in armaments, ammunition, food and equipment. Soviet workers, collective farmers and intellectuals have placed the national economy of the Soviet Union in the service of the front, and supplied the Red Army with everything necessary for victory. The enemy's former numerical superiority in tanks and aircraft is a thing of the past, whereas the economic possibilities of the Soviet Union are growing day by day.

Thus the Soviet people have upset all the enemy's calculations on the instability of the Soviet system. The Soviet State, based on the inviolable fraternal companionship of its peoples, has been consolidated and has gained strength in the course of the war; whereas the fascist state, based on the oppression of nations, has failed to stand the trials of war and faces inevitable catastrophe. Such is the political result of the past three years of the Patriotic War.

Three years ago the Hitlerites believed themselves masters of Europe. Enslaving the countries of Western Europe, Germany drew Italy, Rumania, Finland, Hungary and Bulgaria into a bandit alliance. Implanting and supporting her agents in neutral countries, she exerted strong pressure upon them and obtained from them important concessions. Hitlerite Germany endangered the life and security of all peoples of the world. At that time the freedom-loving peoples had just

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

begun to unite into a single anti-Hitler camp. Actually, our country singly withstood the onslaught of all the forces of Hitlerite Germany and her associates.

Now the situation has radically changed. Now it is not Hitlerite Germany who advances and scores successes, as was the case three years ago; but on the contrary, the armed forces of the Allied states batter and press back the German-fascist invaders everywhere. The Allied states enjoy a superiority over the enemy as regards the numbers and quality of troops and armaments. The unity of the Allied states is now firm as never before. The Allied states have coordinated plans for the utter defeat of the armed forces of Hitlerite Germany.

The brilliantly carried out invasion of northern France by the British and American troops, and the successful offensive of Allied troops in Italy, mean that henceforward Germany will have to fight on the territory of Europe both against the Red Army and against the troops of our Allies, Great Britain and the United States of America. Now when the joint efforts of the Red Army and the Armies of our Allies are aimed directly at the liberation of the countries enslaved by the Germans, when the troops of the United Nations with an iron hand grasp Hitlerite Germany and her vassals in Europe by their throats, the Hitler band can no longer avert by any means its inevitable and complete defeat.

It is now clear to everyone that the Hitlerites, who were out to conquer the whole world, undertook a task which was beyond their strength. The position of the Hitlerite clique reminds of the fate of the frog from Krylov's fable which tried to equal the bull in corpulence, panted and puffed up, but then burst from exertion and died. The bandit fascist bloc is falling apart.

As a result of grave military defeats fascist Germany has found herself on the verge of destruction. Italy, Germany's former ally, now fights against the German imperialists. The criminal ruling clique of Finland, in order to please Hitler, has rejected the generous peace proposals of the Soviet Union and actually has already brought Finland to a military debacle. Hitler's other vassals—Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria—hang over an abyss. The associates of fascist Germany in Europe have had enough time and all the necessary conditions to break with Germany and save their countries from ruin and devastating war. However, the Hitlerites' associates have grown too firmly together with Hitler's bandit gang and do not care about the fate of their peoples. Hitler's Finnish, Rumanian, Hungarian and Bulgarian flunkeys prefer to act in detriment to the interests of the peoples of their countries, in order to please fascist Germany. Hitler's flunkeys have brought matters to such a pass that their countries have been occupied by German troops. In an effort to delay the shifting of the war to the territory of Germany, the Hitlerites have transformed Finland, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria into a for-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ward edge of Germany's defense. However, the peoples of these countries, whose rulers sold themselves to the Hitlerites, now have the opportunity of ejecting the German occupationists and their underlings from their countries with the support of the armed forces of the Allied states. Only in this way can the peoples of Hitler's vassal countries win their right to liberty.

The Hitlerites' rule in Europe has clearly demonstrated that the fascists strangle the freedom and independence of nations. At the same time, the Armies of the United Nations are marching to Europe as the liberators of the peoples from Hitlerite tyranny, and enter the territories of countries oppressed by the fascists in order to restore the freedom and independence of the peoples. For this very reason the peoples enslaved by the Germans now render and will continue to render ever-growing support to the armed forces of the United Nations.

Thus all the calculations and plans of the Hitlerite invaders-imperialists in the sphere of foreign policy have completely collapsed in the progress of the war; the Hitlerite bandits' bloc has gone bankrupt, while the alliance of the freedom-loving peoples has grown to become an invincible force and now has every possibility to destroy the bandit nest of the fascist aggressors in Europe, to punish those guilty of the sufferings and calamities of peoples and to thwart the possibility of the repetition of annexationist wars. Such is the result of the three years of war in foreign policy.

The military and political results of the three years of war clearly prove that Hitlerite Germany has already lost the war and that the hour of her utter defeat is nearing. The armies of the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the United States are storming their way from all sides toward the most important vital centers of fascist Germany, and the time is not distant when the triumph of these efforts will be announced.

The war is now nearing the end. But the remaining part of the road to complete victory will not be easy. The war has entered the most violent, decisive and most difficult phase. The injured, hunted-down fascist beast will furiously snap back. The nearer the front approaches the vital centers of Germany, the stiffer will be the Hitlerites' resistance. Several more powerful blows will be needed in order to completely crush the enemy and throw him to the dust. It is clear that these tasks can be accomplished only by joint resolute actions of the armies of the Allied countries, and by putting in time the main armed forces at the disposal of the United Nations into active battles against Hitlerite Germany and her vassals. It is not to be doubted that the Allied states, which set as their purpose saving the world from the fascist pogrom-makers, will bring into action all their forces in order to achieve this great aim.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ARMED STRUGGLE OF THE POLISH PEOPLE AGAINST THE HITLERITE INVADERS

[*The following article, which appeared in* War and the Working Class, *No. 13, is by T.— a representative of the National Council of Poland* (Karjowa Rada Narodowa) *—who has been in the Soviet Union since May.*]

THE disaster of September, 1939, strikingly demonstrated the rottenness of the foundations upon which the Polish army rested. The people learned the truth about their army. It was evident that the high command had not prepared it for war against the German aggressor and had not supplied it with modern armament; that it was ignorant of modern methods of warfare and that its theories and views were antiquated.

When the critical moment came, a number of high commanders, protégés of Rydz-Smigly, did not display even the necessary personal qualities. They betrayed cowardice and pusillanimity and lack of a sense of responsibility. Some of the army commanders abandoned their troops to their fate and fled by plane or automobile. An example was set by Commander-in-Chief Rydz-Smigly himself, who fled together with his staff. So did War Minister Kaspszicki and the Chief of the General Staff Stachewycz.

On the other hand, in this unequal war in which the enemy had an overwhelming superiority in numbers and armaments, the Polish soldiers, a large part of the officers and several high commanders revealed a fine fighting spirit. Fighting under the most difficult odds, they displayed heroism, staunchness and self-sacrifice. The defense of Warsaw and the battles of Kutno and the Westerplatte will always remain heroic pages in Poland's history.

At the end of 1939 and the beginning of 1940 the Polish people and soldiers were buoyed up by the hope of victory for the Western Allies. Before France's defeat we had guerrilla detachments consisting of remnants of the Polish army which fought the German occupation forces to the best of their ability. The commander of one of these detachments assumed the *nom de guerre* of "Major Kubala," after one of our flying officers who before the war had the courage to raise his voice against the backwardness of the Polish army, for which he was cashiered and thrown into prison. This detail is significant of the sentiments of that section of the regular officers of the Polish army who refused to lay

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

down their arms after the 1939 disaster.

The defeat of France was another disaster for us. The prospect and hope of Poland's early deliverance vanished. Nevertheless, the people did not cease to resist the invader, and the armed struggle spread.

The German occupation forces strove methodically and systematically to smash the resistance of the Polish people and to crush their fighting spirit. They resorted to mass terror, designed physically to exterminate all recalcitrant elements. In these gloomy times a new expression became current in Poland—"Lapanka," from the word meaning "to grab." A brutal manhunt began. The Germans instituted wholesale roundups, seized people in the streets and shot and hanged them or threw them into concentration camps. All this was done in a manner calculated to strike terror into the hearts of the people. The German fiends daily murdered Poles in prisons and concentration camps and then sent telegrams informing their relatives of their death. They wanted to sow panic, to intimidate and break the spirit of the Polish people.

At the beginning of 1941 Poland was inundated with German troops. Endless columns of troops and armament streamed along the roads and through the streets of the cities. Sometimes pedestrians had to wait for hours on one side of a street, unable to cross. Hitler's hordes swept in an avalanche to the East.

In the face of this flood of German troops the struggle against the Germans in Poland temporarily subsided. Isolated armed actions and acts of sabotage did not cease, but they did not bear a systematic character.

After Germany's treacherous attack upon the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, the so-called *Sanacja* camp, which tended to place itself more and more in subordination to the Polish government in London, issued the slogan, "Two of our enemies have collided in the East. We must sit tight and wait." The Polish reactionaries who after the September disaster lay low like mice under a stove now began to stir again. Illegal meetings in military organizations of these elements called upon the officers to refrain from armed struggle on the grounds that it would "only complicate matters for the Germans." In their illegal press they recommended "passive waiting."

As we know, at that time there were two military organizations on Polish territory led by reactionary officers of the *Sanacja* camp: the Union of Armed Struggle (ZWZ) and the staff of the Defenders of Poland. Both had been "empowered" by the Polish government-in-exile to recruit armed forces in Poland; both were sent money, arms and instructions to "sit tight and wait." The chief concern of these elements was to prevent the mass development of the armed struggle. The military reactionaries insistently asserted that the fate of France awaited the Soviet Union too.

Sikorski's agreement with the Soviet Union, which was taken by the people of Poland as a signal to coordinate our struggle with the ac-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of the Red Army, was proclaimed a "diplomatic ruse" on the part of the government-in-exile. The Poles were fed on propaganda that the Soviet Union was the enemy of Poland. This propaganda hampered the development of the armed struggle of the Polish people. A turn of affairs came only with the defeat of the Germans before Moscow. The Red Army's first victories were hailed with profound relief by the Polish people, and gave a powerful fillip to the struggle against the Germans.

Meanwhile democratic parties formed their own armed detachments. In the rural districts, peasant battalions and peasant guards sprang up: there were the People's Militia, the Union of Liberation, etc. Guerrilla detachments at that time grew spontaneously all over the country. It was a general movement of the people. In January and February of 1942 guerrillas were already active in the Seidlitz and Lublin areas. We attempted to establish contact with them. The first guerrilla detachments appeared in Central Poland.

The Polish Workers Party was one of the first systematically to form its armed squads under the name of the People's Guard. A "guerrilla school" was started near Warsaw, at which a short course of instruction was given on how to blow up railway tracks and derail trains, in the use of arms and explosives, etc. Most of the students were youths.

We had very few arms. But this squad, which consisted of about twenty men, we tried to "arm to the teeth." With great difficulty we obtained grenades, explosives and wrenches with which to dismantle rails, shears for cutting telephone and telegraph wire, compasses and electric torches. It was a solemn and exciting day for us all when this squad, which we named the Stepan Czarnecki Detachment, left Warsaw to go into action. On May 3 we sent it by ordinary train to the Petrokow area. The guerrillas boarded the train with all their equipment, for at that time the Germans were not keeping a particular watch on trains.

In the first brush with the Germans the detachment commander, who went under the nickname of "Little Franek," was wounded. He returned to Warsaw. There we looked after him and when his wounds were healed we sent him out again, this time as commander of all the guerrillas.

After this, one detachment after another left Warsaw. We fitted out and sent off one and sometimes more per week, although it was getting more and more difficult to procure arms for them.

The Polish government-in-exile in London and its underground press in Poland continued to insist that it was premature to fight the Germans, and recommended "waiting with rifle at attention" until the "government," in whose hands all threads were focused, gave the signal for action. These people launched a campaign against the guerrilla detachments and against all organizations which were resisting the Germans. They tried to intimidate the masses by warning

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them of German reprisals, and asserted that the "conditions" for guerrilla warfare such as existed in Yugoslavia and occupied Soviet territories did not exist in Poland.

However, the Polish people and Polish soldiers thought otherwise and acted accordingly. The agitation against the armed fight against the Germans naturally hampered the development of the guerrilla movement; nevertheless, the Polish military reactionaries failed to compromise the movement and to isolate it from the people as they wanted to do. Nothing came of their efforts.

The Polish population actively supported the guerrillas and the idea of waging armed struggle against the Germans. The people had an opportunity to convince themselves in practice that the guerrilla movement and the fight against the Germans did not worsen their plight but on the contrary improved it. When the Germans tried to plunder the peasants the guerrillas interfered, attacked food requisitioning stations, released prisoners and disrupted German rail and road traffic.

The Polish people eagerly followed the action of the heroic Red Army and in every way possible demonstrated their sympathy for the Soviet people in their fight against the common enemy. Poles, for example, concealed Red Army men who escaped from German captivity, shared their meager provisions with them and even furnished them with arms. It was evident that the Polish people were pinning their hopes mainly on the Red Army.

The Germans strove to crush the mounting resistance of the people and the growing guerrilla movement. A new wave of atrocities swept the country. Arrested persons were publicly hanged in the streets in groups and it was forbidden to remove the corpses. The terror was fiercest of all in Warsaw, heart of the patriotic movement.

In October, 1942, fifty members of democratic underground organizations were hanged in the capital.

It was decided to counter these attempts to crush the spirit of Warsaw. In retaliation for the executions, armed squads of the People's Guard made a number of bold and simultaneous raids on Germans in the center of the city: several cafes and restaurants where the German military were carousing were wrecked, as was also the printshop of the German newspaper *New Warsaw Courier*. A number of German officers were killed.

These blows at the Germans were carried out by very modest forces, poorly armed in addition. Nevertheless, the impression they created was immense and the whole country sympathized. The Germans did not dare again to erect gallows in Warsaw. But they imposed an indemnity of one million zloties on the city. We decided again to retaliate. No sooner had the indemnity been collected than we raided the KKO (Municipal Savings Bank) where it had been placed and confiscated all the cash we found there

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—about two million zloties. The effect was prodigious. The Germans did not dare wreak fresh reprisals.

Warsaw's example was widely followed. Attacks on the Germans began in Radom, Cracow, Lublin and Lodz.

In May, 1942, the command of the guerrilla detachments united in the People's Guard began to issue regular communiqués on the course of hostilities. The Polish people were now waging incessant armed struggle against the Germans. In January, 1943, the united forces of the democratic military organizations came out in defense of the peasants of South Lubel, who had been evicted and ruined by the occupation authorities. In March and April of 1943 there were already whole districts through which a German motor vehicle or train did not dare to pass.

In May, 1943, when a temporary lull set in on the Soviet-German front, the Germans sent about eight divisions, including motorized regiments, to crush the guerrilla movement in Poland. At the same time attempts were made to sow dissension in the ranks of the Polish liberation movement, for which purpose the Hitlerites engineered the Katyn affair. We do not know whether the Germans and the Polish reactionaries had come to an agreement on the matter, but a section of the Polish press in London, which is under the control of the Polish government, and the German press began simultaneously to raise a loud noise over the Katyn affair, and started a despicable campaign against the Soviet Union in connection with it.

In May, 1943, savage measures were also undertaken against the Jews: Jewish ghettos in Warsaw and other towns were brutally exterminated.

To a certain extent the Hitlerites and their Polish confederates succeeded in darkening the minds of the Polish officers. They managed to put a brake on the movement toward active armed struggle against the Germans that had already begun among the ZWZ detachments, which by that time had been brought under the control of the fascist General Sosnkowski. A profound ferment had begun among these military organizations. The success of the guerrilla movement stirred the rank and file of these organizations and they kept demanding more and more insistently of the commands of the ZWZ: why are we sitting with arms folded—why aren't we fighting the Germans when such a fight is necessary and possible?

This dissatisfaction and unrest became particularly acute after the death of Sikorski, when the Polish army came under the command of Sosnkowski, whom Polish officers considered responsible for the September disaster no less than Rydz-Smigly. I myself have been told by high commanders of detachments under Sosnkowski's control that they would never allow him to come back to Poland.

The Polish government-in-exile knew that the soldiers of the ZWZ were restless. They were aware that they could keep the Polish

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

soldiers under their control and influence only by changing their policy in one degree or another. They therefore issued a slogan for "restricted struggle," and a policy of feigned warfare was begun. Military organizations, for example, were given categorical instructions not to damage German communications, as this would be tantamount to helping the Soviet Union.

Seeing that they were unable to prevent the growth of the guerrilla movement, the Hitlerites started a new wave of terror. The Poles were given to understand they might expect the fate of the Jews. Five hundred members of underground military organizations belonging to the most diverse parties were shot in Paviak prison in Warsaw. Savage reprisals were taken all over Poland.

These reprisals only incensed the Poles all the more against the Germans. "Revenge Paviak!"—under this war-cry the democratic military organizations headed by the People's Guard decided to strike a blow at the Germans by their united efforts. One Sunday in Warsaw, in broad daylight, armed Polish detachments fell upon and demolished a company of picked storm troopers. This happened in the center of the city, on Uiazdowski Avenue, which the Germans had renamed Avenue of Victors. Simultaneously attacks were made upon German cafés and restaurants and German street cars.

The Poles knew that the Red Army was overwhelming the Germans and sweeping irresistibly forward. The direct response to this in Poland was that the people fought the German invaders with increased vigor and organization. The German machinations proved futile. They not only failed to break up the guerrilla movement; they even failed to weaken the struggle. Nor did the Sosnkowski clique succeed in fanning fratricidal war in Poland; the piratical attacks on the guerrilla detachments engineered by their agents aroused the indignation of the people.

Our detachments destroyed many railway trains, wrecked a number of stations and interrupted railway traffic for thousands of hours. The guerrillas exterminated thousands of Germans, including several generals, liberated many thousands of prisoners and saved the lives of a large number of Polish patriots. They wrecked hundreds of police stations, rural administration offices and food requisitioning stations.

In their impotent fury the German occupation authorities intensified their reprisals, hanging people in the streets and burning down whole villages. In the face of this terror, a spontaneous and irresistible desire to unite all forces for the joint struggle against the enemy grew up within the ranks of the democratic military organizations. The militant Polish people were unanimous in this demand; they awaited the creation of a center which would unite the country's action, and leadership which would be bound to the people by ties of struggle and blood. The fight against the Germans insistently demanded the creation of a single

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commanding staff for Poland's armed forces.

Another reason why central leadership was necessary was to solve the burning question of procuring arms. We dug up weapons which had been concealed after the defeat of the Polish army in September, 1939; we took arms from defeated German troops and from German depots; we purchased arms with money seized from the Germans. Lastly, some arms which the Polish government in London sent its organization fell into our possession when their detachments came over to our side. But this was all too little.

Preparations for the creation of a united leadership of Poland's armed forces lasted all through the second half of 1943. Correspondence and negotiations between the underground organizations began in the summer of that year. A People's Army was formed under the most difficult and trying conditions, without any outside help. It was born not on paper or in offices, but in the field, in the course of the struggle against the German tyrants. It was the direct antithesis of the army formed on Polish territory by Sosnkowski. By that time, when the idea of forming a People's Army was fully ripe, the government-in-exile rechristened its armed detachments *Armja Krajowa*. Its officers and staffs existed before it had any soldiers. But even when it had soldiers, officers and staffs it undertook no military action.

The People's Army was formed by the people, for the people and to fight for the people's liberty. Sosnkowski's army was formed as an army standing above the people, to keep the people in check.

A word must be said about the moral state of *Armja Krajowa*. The slogan "passive waiting" and the slogan "restricted warfare" which succeeded it, had a demoralizing and debilitating effect upon the officers and men of Sosnkowski's army. Even the feigned struggle undertaken lately under the pressure of events and the mood of the masses has not altered the situation. The army is being demoralized. It is doing no fighting and is not training fighting men. Actually speaking, only its staffs are active, as well as its underground newspapers, which are carrying on a disgusting campaign against the Soviet Union and against organized and effective struggle against the German forces of occupation.

The People's Guard, peasant battalions, Peasant Guard, People's Militia (military organization of the Polish Socialist Workers Party) and even some of the detachments of *Armja Krajowa* simultaneously realized the necessity of uniting their armed detachments under a single command. Cooperation among these detachments arose in practice in the fire of struggle and sprang from experience. All realized that single leadership was essential.

The union of the armed detachments in Poland under a single command became possible thanks to the union of all democratic and anti-German forces in Poland under the National Council of Poland (*Krajowa Rada Narodowa*). On

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

January 1, 1944, the day the Council was formed, a united leadership of the armed forces of the Polish people was created. A general staff and territorial staffs were set up.

The union of the armed forces of the Polish people and the formation of a People's Army were hailed with jubilation. The mood of soldiers and officers of our armed detachments became more militant than ever.

The fight against the forces of occupation has produced new commanders, sub-commanders and soldiers. Many of the officers and soldiers of *Armja Krajowa* have come over to our side—sometimes whole detachments with their commanders and arms. They had grown disgusted with inactivity, with calls to wait, and wanted to fight the invaders. One of the first high commanders to join our ranks was General Rola. He began as a minor commander and now occupies the post of commander of the People's Army.

With the creation of the People's Army the armed struggle against the Germans has been put on a higher level. Since the beginning of this year a number of serious blows have been dealt the German communications in Poland. We have succeeded in coordinating the activities of the separate guerrilla detachments. We intend to create entire guerrilla regions from which the occupation forces have been completely ejected.

When we representatives of the National Council were on our way to cross the front line into the Soviet Union, in some districts we traveled by day under the escort of guerrillas fully armed and in Polish uniform.

The People's Army cannot accept into its ranks all who desire to join, owing to the lack of arms. If we had arms we could create an army several thousand strong. The Polish people through the National Council of Poland have appealed to all the Governments of the United Nations to help them with arms.

Our immediate task is to rouse and arm the Polish people to fight the German occupation forces for the liberation of Poland. This fight will be fully coordinated and concerted with the armed action of our Allies in the East and the West.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RESOLUTION OF THE UNION OF POLISH PATRIOTS IN THE U.S.S.R.

[The following resolution, adopted by the Executive Board of the Union of Polish Patriots in the U.S.S.R., on June 23, appeared in the latest issue of the newspaper Wolna Polska.]

THE Executive Board of the Union of Polish Patriots in the U.S.S.R. extends its greetings to the delegation of the National Council of Poland (*Krajowa Rada Narodowa*) and to the Chief Command of the People's Army that arrived from Poland.

The Union of Polish Patriots in the U.S.S.R., uniting as it does in its ranks Poles of various social positions and different political views on a platform of struggle against the German invaders for the independent and democratic parliamentarism of Poland, has from the first day of its existence considered it its main task to contribute, by all efforts and means, to the liberation of Poland from the German yoke and give every assistance to our native land in its struggle against the German invaders.

The Union of Polish Patriots has worked tirelessly for the realization of this main task in spite of the intrigues of the reactionary emigré circles who have placed their own selfish interests above the interests of the nation, in spite of those who are continuing the ruinous policy that led Poland to the disaster of September, 1939, in spite of those who by interfering with the struggle against the invaders are injuring the cause of the United Nations.

On the initiative and with the active assistance of the Union of Polish Patriots there has been created the Polish Army in the U.S.S.R., which, with its own blood, has proved its loyalty to our people in its struggle for the Polish land that is now trampled by the enemy. Splendidly armed, thanks to the friendly assistance of the Soviet Government, the Polish Army in the U.S.S.R. has demonstrated its high fighting qualities and heroism in battles fought together with the Red Army.

The Union of Polish Patriots in the U.S.S.R. has proved time and again on the basis of irrefutable facts that the reactionary command of General Sosnkowski's so-called *Armja Krajowa,* contrary to the desires of the majority of officers and men, not only holds aloof from the struggle of the Polish people against the German invaders, not only seeks to paralyze this struggle by its calls for passivity and waiting, but in fact plays into the hands of the invaders by its entire behavior, unleashes a fratricidal war among the Poles, and is preparing on the sly for a civil war in Poland.

The Union of Polish Patriots, defending as it does the most vital

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests of the Polish people, has from the very beginning of its existence refused to recognize the legality of the so-called Polish government-in-exile based on the illegal constitution of the 1935 government which, by its reactionary policy, interferes with the unity of all the live forces of the Polish people and by its consistently pursued anti-Soviet policy seeks to sow discord in the camp of the United Nations and undermines the confidence in Poland among our great friends, Great Britain, the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

The Polish people have turned away from the handful of reactionary emigrés and set up on the territory of Poland itself a center of national unity for the struggle against the German invaders. This center is the National Council of Poland.

The Union of Polish Patriots recognizes in the National Council of Poland the true representation of our people and expresses its confidence that the National Council of Poland, formed by the most devoted patriotic elements of the Polish people, will rally round itself all Poles and mobilize them for the struggle in close alliance with the peoples of the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the United States, and will lead them to victory over Hitlerite tyranny.

In the formation of the National Council of Poland and the People's Army and its High Command, the Union of Polish Patriots sees the beginning of the amalgamation of all Polish armed forces, both on the territory of Poland and beyond it.

The Union of Polish Patriots in the U.S.S.R. is firmly convinced that the National Council of Poland, by rallying all the democratic Polish forces on the territory of Poland and abroad, lays the foundation for an independent, free, strong and democratic Poland. The Union of Polish Patriots is firmly convinced that the National Council of Poland will create the prerequisites for the formation of a provisional national government enjoying the confidence of the people, a government for Poland's liberation, a government which will guarantee victory over the enemy and pave the way for the flowering of the material and spiritual forces of the Polish people on the road to peaceful cooperation with all freedom-loving nations.

THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE UNION OF POLISH PATRIOTS IN THE U.S.S.R.

Lieutenant General Zygmund Berling, Jakob Berman, Dr. Julia Bristiger, Wanda Wasilewska, Zenon Wasilewski, Kazimierz Witaszewski, Andrzej Witos, Engineer Jan Grubiecki; Dr. Boleslaw Drobner, Dr. Stefan Jedrychowski, Major General Aleksander Zawadzki, Halina Zawadska, Ignac Kowalski, Wladyslaw Krasnowiecki, Reverend Franciszek Kupsz, Antoni Michalak, Engineer Mieczyslaw Popiel, Porucznik Edmund Pszczolkowski, Colonel Wladyslaw Putrament, Stanislaw Radkiewicz, Dr. Stanislav Skrzeszewski, Major Wladyslaw Sokolowski, Wlodzimierz Sokorski, Dr. Emil Sommerstein and Dr. Jerzy Sztachelski.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

BY ADAM LAPIN

MOST newspaper commentators agreed that the G.O.P. convention was a political failure. The failure consisted not only in a lack of enthusiasm and spirit but, even more, in the inability of the convention to camouflage the identity of the actual leaders of the Republican Party and the character of the program they have to offer. The job of political concealment will have to come in the course of the campaign. On the other hand, it will be the task of the Roosevelt forces and of the labor movement to tell the people the real story of the Republican convention, to expose the real meaning of the program offered by the G.O.P.

Earl Browder summed up that meaning when he said that the G.O.P. stands for "repudiation of the concord of Teheran." This is found explicitly in the speech of Herbert Hoover, the major ideologist of the convention and the political godfather of Thomas E. Dewey. Hoover condemned the Teheran conference as "power politics" and "balance of power diplomacy." And what did this spokesman for the purest idealism have to offer as an alternative? He said that "hot fires of nationalism are rising out of the emotions of this war," that the Soviet Union is seeking to "expand the Empire," that Churchill does not propose to liquidate the British Empire, and that if the G.O.P. comes to power "it will not be to liquidate either the economic welfare or the independence of the United States." In short, Hoover uses "economic welfare" and "independence" as a screen for a projected policy of power politics with a vengeance. He urges a voracious new American imperialism.

There is a passage in Hoover's speech that appears particularly ominous. It emphasizes the favorite thesis of the defeatists, that American national interest was not at stake in the war. This country entered the war "only because freedom was in jeopardy in all Europe." And the speech goes on: "Therefore, the American people are not likely to welcome any settlements which do not include the independence of Poland as well as every other country which desires to be free from alien domination. Americans do not want this war to end in the restriction of freedom among nations. It is obvious that the United States will emerge from this war the strongest military, and thus political, power in the world. Our power to bring freedom to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world must not be frittered away."

It does not take a mindreader to fathom what Hoover is talking about when he proposes that this country use its political and military power on behalf of "freedom" in the post-war world. He proposes that this power be used to strengthen fascist and anti-Soviet cliques in Europe, to menace the Soviet Union, to strangle the democratic governments which are arising out of the sacrifice and heroism of the people.

There was an interesting change made in the final draft of the Republican platform which points in the same direction. In the streamlined version of the Mackinac declaration submitted to the resolutions committee headed by Senator Taft there was a reference to restoring independence of "the nations which are the victims of Axis aggression." The word "Axis" was taken out. The G.O.P. left an open door for anti-Soviet adventures.

In the foreign policy draft submitted to the resolutions committee the G.O.P. pledged to "sustain the Constitution of the United States in the attainment of our international aims." But the platform as finally approved interpreted the Constitution to mean that both treaties and agreements must be approved by two-thirds of the Senate. This is, of course, an effort to stretch the Constitution in order to cover executive agreements and thus give to the wrecking crew in the Senate a veto over the power of the President to make agreements of the type reached in Cairo and Teheran.

These are some of the weasel words surrounding the Republican pledge of "full cooperation with the United Nations" to win total victory and "organized international cooperation" after the war. There are, of course, other jokers in the foreign policy plank. There are those now notorious and ever so shadowy "peace forces" which are to "prevent or repeal military aggression." And there are the appeals to isolationist prejudice in the injunction against a "world state," and in the demand that United States troops be brought home immediately after the end of hostilities.

There is no doubt, as A. B. Magil has pointed out in *New Masses*, that the Republican foreign policy plank is a step backward even from the vague declaration of Mackinac. And the platform must be taken in conjunction with Hoover's attack on Teheran, with Clare Luce's speech blaming the President in effect for the murder of American servicemen and for the involvement of the United States in the war. It must be taken in conjunction with the foreign trade plank which was a triumph for the primitive protectionists led by Joe Grundy of Pennsylvania. The foreign trade plank promises high tariffs and Congressional veto over reciprocal trade agreements. Viewed against its entire background, the Republican platform means that the G.O.P. would sound the deathknell of Teheran—if it got the chance.

Walter Lippmann has said that the foreign policy plank was written with "intentional ambiguity" and that the domestic program of the G.O.P. invites the "chaos of an uncontrolled inflation of prices and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wages." The G.O.P. promises to end wage stabilization and job controls. It also promises to "terminate rationing, price fixing and all other emergency powers"; presumably these economic controls are to be ended after the war. Actually there is no explicit statement in the platform to assure that these wartime economic measures would not be scrapped in the midst of war.

The G.O.P. platform promises only "to promote the fullest stable employment through private enterprise." Candidate Dewey goes a good deal further. "We Republicans are agreed that full employment shall be a first objective of national policy," he said in his acceptance speech. "By full employment I mean a real chance for every man and woman to earn a decent living, at a decent wage." Dewey promises full employment—and stands on a platform which would wreck foreign trade and promote economic chaos. It is a contradiction in terms, a cruel deception, to reject Teheran — and to promise jobs for all.

The Republican convention represented a complete victory for the reactionary leadership of the G.O.P., for Joe Pew of Sun Oil and Sun Shipbuilding, who had the last word at the convention with his motion to adjourn, for Herbert Hoover, for Senators Taft and Vandenberg and the rest of the G.O.P. old guard in Congress. This dominant group got what it wanted in the platform, in the candidates selected, and in the main speeches at the convention; it may have over-reached itself somewhat by making the extent of its control too transparent. But there was never any question about the control, a control which is shared with defeatists like Col. Robert McCormick and Joseph Patterson.

If the extreme defeatist wing of the G.O.P., represented by McCormick of the *Chicago Tribune*, preferred Bricker to Dewey and was not too happy about some of the demagogy thrown into the platform as a sop to the "internationalists," it quickly reconciled itself to both Dewey and the platform.

* * *

Those delegates who were not in full agreement with the proceedings had little influence at the convention. Their gentle protests made scarcely a ripple. The Hoover-Taft steamroller was prepared to crush any dissenters. And the governors, those vaunted new voices in the Republican Party, were very much on the outside looking in. Governor Sewall of Maine was invited to explain his criticisms of the foreign policy plank at the very moment that copies of the finished plank were already being distributed to newspapermen. Governors Sewall and Edge of New Jersey made threats, but they did not carry the fight to the convention floor.

Delegates who were dissatisfied with the foreign policy plank were themselves not too clear about just what they wanted. All too frequently they tilted with windmills. They fought on the favorite issues of the *Chicago Tribune* crowd, on a "world state" and an international police force; but they forgot about the simple, practical reality of Te-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heran which offered content enough for any platform. Senator Joseph Ball of Minnesota not only raised these abstract issues, but injected anti-Soviet overtones into his defense of smaller nations.

There are fundamental reasons for the ineffectiveness of the delegates, who were not in accord with the defeatist character of the convention. They did not show that they were prepared to put aside partisan considerations and bolt the ticket in the event that their protests were overruled. There was no necessity for Hoover and Taft to bargain with them, to make concessions. And this weakness of those who may roughly be classified as the Willkie delegates at the convention was a reflection of the dilemma of a section of the bourgeoisie within the G.O.P., which while seeing the need for international stability and cooperation, and for extensive foreign trade in the post-war period, cannot make up its mind to come forward with non-partisan support to Roosevelt.

Lippmann is perhaps a typical spokesman for this section of the capitalist class. On the one hand he rejects the program of the Republican Party, while on the other he endorses Dewey and expresses the hope that the candidate will "turn the party in another direction." This is also the position of the *New York Herald Tribune* and the *Chicago Daily News*. Both newspapers editorially expressed alarm at the trend of the Republican convention, and both gave Dewey their full support. They reflect the attitude of those capitalist circles which are in agreement with the President's foreign policies, but fear his progressive domestic program and his close ties with labor and hope that Dewey will give them what they want.

Either to deceive themselves or their readers, these newspapers have tried to build up a non-existent split between Dewey and the Republican machine. Actually Dewey was the choice of the machine, Herbert Hoover's handpicked candidate. If the delegates displayed little warmth for Dewey, it was not because they felt that he was unsafe politically; their cool reception of Dewey reflected partly the generally unenthusiastic atmosphere at the Republican convention and partly a personal dislike for Dewey by many delegates who consider him arrogant and stiff-necked.

Dewey is a valuable asset for the G.O.P.; not only his youthful appearance and well-trained radio voice but even more the very fact that he does not appear to be directly associated with the defeatist record of the Republican Party. Dewey will have a much broader appeal than a Bricker or a Taft. He is perhaps the only candidate the G.O.P. could put forward who is capable at one and the same press conference of welcoming the support of the defeatist *Chicago Tribune* and gently criticizing the vagueness of the foreign policy plank in the Republican platform.

If the *Chicago Daily News* and the *New York Herald Tribune* could not find much in Dewey's acceptance speech to justify their faith in the candidate, they were contented with praising his delivery

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and manner. But what did Dewey have to offer in his speech? A little more subtly than Hoover, but nonetheless clearly, he sniped at the Teheran agreement, jeering at "a little group of rulers who meet together in private conferences." When Dewey asked emphatically, "Do we have to have a war in order to get jobs?" the audience sensed an undertone of opposition to the war, which was greeted with substantial applause. For the rest, there were hackneyed attacks on the President and the Administration, plus a new emphasis on the age of the President and his advisers as contrasted with his own youth, about which much will be heard during the campaign. At his press conference Dewey was asked whether he was satisfied with gasoline rationing. He could have said something about the need for gasoline at the front. Instead, he replied: "Do you know of anyone who is satisfied?" He made a cheap attempt to cash in on petty dissatisfactions with wartime controls.

Whether they realize it or not, those who stress this fictitious separation between Dewey and his party are performing a most important service for the G.O.P. Indeed, it may well become part of the official Republican campaign strategy. If the people cannot be induced to vote for the Republican platform, they can perhaps be persuaded to vote for Dewey on the illusion that they will get something very much like Roosevelt. The "liberal" supporters of Dewey can play a most dangerous and deceptive role.

* * *

The widespread disgust with the Republican convention, with the speeches and the platform, should not cause us, however, to underestimate the chances of the Dewey-Bricker ticket. True, the G.O.P. will be handicapped by patriotic fervor for the war which will find expression in votes for the Commander-in-Chief; but it will have the backing of powerful forces which must not be minimized.

The G.O.P. will have the support of at least a good part of that section of the capitalist class represented by the *New York Herald Tribune,* and it is sure of the generous support of such great aggregates of wealth as the Pews, du Ponts, and Mellons.

A very substantial portion of the press, including in unprincipled alliance the *Chicago Tribune* and the *New York Herald Tribune* and a great many papers in between, will be opposing the President. There will be behind the Republican ticket the midwest reactionary financial interests which supported America First and which have so articulate and powerful a spokesman in the *Chicago Tribune.* The Republicans intend to rally around them the entire lunatic fringe vote, the followers of Charles Coughlin, Gerald L. K. Smith and the like. It is no accident that Smith and other fascist leaders hung around the G.O.P. convention like bees around honey. The G.O.P. cannot welcome the fascist outfits too heartily, but it will not drive them away either. They may not have too much to offer in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the way of a mass vote, but every little bit counts.

While relying heavily on campaign contributions from the most reactionary sections of Big Business, the G.O.P. will make particularly ardent overtures to the middle class. The G.O.P. is counting heavily on the middle class vote, on confusion and misunderstanding about O.P.A. and other government war controls.

The Republicans do not hope to win a majority of the labor vote, but they certainly will make an effort to cut down the margin for Roosevelt in big industrial areas. This is the meaning of the boomlet for William Hutcheson of the Carpenters Union as Vice President. It was to call attention to the fact that the G.O.P., too, has a few labor leaders. And this was the meaning of the demagogic attack on wage and job controls in the G.O.P. platform. The platform merely "accepts the purposes" of the Wagner Act, Social Security Act, etc. But it goes all out on promises which have a glittering surface appeal and at the same time threaten to destroy the manpower and stabilization programs. It is significant that, while apparently giving up the C.I.O. for lost, the G.O.P. does make efforts to win the A. F. of L. vote by criticizing administration of the Wagner Act and endorsing the demand of some A. F. of L. leaders for a stronger Department of Labor.

The convention made a special play for the Negro vote, and there is no doubt that this will be among the major drives of the Republicans. They hope to cash in on the justifiable resentment that exists against Jim Crow and discrimination in the army and civilian life.

Stress should be laid on the convention's demagogic approach to Negro issues, which may temporarily confuse sections of the Negro people. The Republican platform favors elimination of the poll-tax, but by means of a constitutional amendment, altogether dodging commitment to speedy repeal by Congressional legislation. It claims to be for anti-lynch legislation, but forgets to mention whether it is to be by Federal or state action, or perhaps by municipal ordinance. It proposes that Army Jim Crow be "investigated" by a committee.

By stressing the fact that the Bilbos and the Rankins are Democrats, the G.O.P. hopes to make the Negro people forget about the record of G.O.P. cooperation with poll-taxers in Congress on virtually every major issue, including the attempt to kill F.E.P.C. The Republicans, and particularly Dewey, will try to buy Negro support by handing out some jobs to key Negro citizens.

Perhaps most important of all to the Republicans is getting a solid farm vote. It is on this that they pin their real hope of defeating the President. A very interesting Republican survey published in the *Chicago Tribune* forecasts a close election, with the Republicans naturally having a slight edge. The Democrats are given the South, Southwest and border states along with California and Washington. The Republicans claim Pennsylvania and most of New England; but principally they put in their column

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the entire midwest without exception, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, etc. They concede as doubtful states Connecticut, Missouri and New York. But it is in the midwest, with its large farm population, that the Republicans claim to have their greatest strongholds. And there is no doubt that the farm vote remains a serious and as yet largely unsolved problem which has received all too little attention from labor and the Administration.

Attacks on wartime economic controls will be a major bait for the farm and middle class vote. There will also be attempts to befuddle the voter with wild Red-baiting against the Administration of the kind found in some of the principal convention speeches, including those made by ex-President Herbert Hoover and House Republican leader Joe Martin. There is also the possibility of strike provocations, such as hinted by Westbrook Pegler in recent columns, and of confusion that would result from large-scale but totally unplanned cutbacks in war production. Of course, the Republicans are also counting on the handsome appearance and attractive radio voice of Dewey and the appeal of relative youthfulness to get the votes of many who are politically inexperienced. Add up all these facts and you get a reasonably clear picture of both actual and potential G.O.P. strength; you also get an explanation of why hard-headed businessmen are willing to spend large sums of money in the Republican campaign.

There is considerable strength in this miscellaneous combination of forces on which the Republicans count for support—and considerable weakness. There is only one way in which the loose coalition forming around the Republicans can be shattered and pulverized—by bringing to the American people in the clearest and strongest terms the meaning of the real threat of the G.O.P. to American and world security and by uniting around the President the broadest and most representative kind of non-partisan coalition.

It would be a mistake to assume that the President cannot win the backing of substantial sections of finance capital. Indeed, it would be a political mistake of the first order to permit the Republicans to create the impression that the President is solely the candidate of labor. The Republican platform is an insult to the enlightened self-interest of patriotic businessmen who know that their own future rests with friendly relations between the United Nations, with expanded world trade and full employment after the war. It is not too much to assume that many Republican businessmen will act accordingly. One influential midwest newspaper, the conservative Republican *Milwaukee Journal*, has not only severely criticized the Republican convention but has so far refused to endorse Dewey. There are some well-informed observers who think that the *Milwaukee Journal*, which backed Willkie in the Wisconsin primary, will stay on the fence in the November election.

Both Wendell Willkie and Russell Davenport, his 1940 campaign manager, have had some sharp words

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the Republican platform. Willkie's submitted but ignored platform-draft well reveals the gulf between him and the G.O.P. What Willkie himself will do is not yet clear. But there is no doubt that many prominent Willkie supporters and thousands of rank-and-file Republicans who voted for him can be induced to support the President. This can be an important factor in many close states, including Wisconsin, Ohio, Massachusetts, and California.

The Administration forces, the entire win-the-war coalition behind the President, cannot afford to abandon either the farm vote or the city middle classes to Dewey. The very nature of the G.O.P. convention can do much to expose the real forces behind the Republican Party and their aims, if this becomes a matter of public knowledge. The specific effects of the various planks in the G.O.P. platform, both on the war effort and on the post-war world, cannot but make all sections of the population realize that a G.O.P. victory would be disastrous to them.

The great bulk of the Republican voters are for postwar collaboration with our Allies, for a stable peace, and for the economic objectives of the Teheran program. If the Hooverite attack on the Soviet Union and the Deweyan attack on Teheran become widely known, they will repel these voters. The mass of Americans understand the necessity for wartime price controls and are for them, even if there are disagreements regarding details. The intent of the platform that price controls and rationing be weakened now and quickly abandoned upon the conclusion of peace will turn many away from the G.O.P.

All sections of the population are concerned with post-war economy and realize that world collaboration and internal planning are necessary to solve the job and business questions. The Hooverite attitude of the G.O.P. platform toward those issues will alienate many Republicans—if they learn the facts.

Finally, farmers and middle class people and even big businessmen have boys in the armed forces and will not want to take a chance with Dewey. With them, as with all other patriotic Americans, Republican sabotage of the soldier vote—and particularly Dewey's brazen sabotage—can become an important election factor. It was Dewey who helped the G.O.P.-Rankin leadership in the House to kill the Worley Federal Soldier Vote bill by sending a wire to a prominent Republican in the course of the debate stating that New York would not honor a Federal ballot on the grounds that it was unconstitutional in that state. He then proceeded to have one of the worst state bills in the nation passed in the New York Legislature.

It is all very well for the G.O.P. platform to talk about consulting servicemen concerning the post-war world. But this demagogy will not stand up very well against the cold fact that the G.O.P. blocked an effective ballot for servicemen. This can become one of the most vulnerable points in Dewey's armor.

The reason for G.O.P. opposition to any decent soldier vote measure is, of course, the recognition that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that vote may lose them the election. A similar realization should spur the pro-Roosevelt forces to take every available action that will get out the soldier vote.

All these factors point to the need for emphasizing the non-partisan support of Roosevelt in the elections. Both the program and the performance of the G.O.P. leadership are so at variance with the aspirations of the great majority of Republican voters that large numbers will break away once they grasp that fact. On the other hand, the President does represent these aspirations, and the fight for his re-election should, therefore, be aimed at winning the non-partisan support of the Republican voters, together with the independents and Democrats.

When A. F. of L. President William Green belittled the difference to labor of a Democratic or a Republican victory, Sidney Hillman retorted that any labor leader who took that view was "betraying the interests" of his own organization. Hillman said this at the C.I.O. Political Action Committee meeting before the Republican convention. And it is doubly true when the real character of the G.O.P. and its candidates stands clearly exposed before the nation.

The labor movement has the job of winning for the President the votes of the 12,000,000 organized workers and their families along with the voting strength of the unorganized workers. There is still much that remains to be desired in this respect, particularly in terms of C.I.O.-A. F. of L.-Railroad Brotherhoods unity on a state and local scale. But the labor movement has the additional responsibility of helping to shape the nature of the campaign in each state and community, of functioning as a force for clarifying the issues and for welding the unity of the people, regardless of party affiliation, Democrats, Republicans, workers, businessmen and farmers, behind the re-election of the President.

To this end, the resolution adopted by the National Convention of the Communist Political Association on Earl Browder's Report in May of this year states:

"To guarantee victory in the 1944 elections it is necessary for all patriotic Americans to steer a firm course of national unity, of common action, to speed the prosecution of the war, to ensure the continuance of Roosevelt's leadership and anti-Axis policies, and to secure the election of a victory Congress, supporting the President, dedicated to the program of Teheran and representative of the entire coalition of national unity. It is necessary for the people to insist that an end shall be put to all partisan policies and conflicts and that a resolute struggle shall be waged against all defeatist and negotiated peace groups and activities. And it is supremely imperative to advance labor's political organization, its united activity and its active collaboration with all other patriotic forces, irrespective of party labels."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THOMAS' "SOCIALISTS" AID FASCISM

BY PAUL NOVICK

THE election platform adopted by the Socialist Party convention held in the first days of June in Reading, Pennsylvania, demands *"an immediate political peace offensive based on the offer of an armistice to the peoples of the Axis nations."* The Allies, it claims (in perfect oblivion of Teheran), "have no war or peace aims other than the military defeat of their German and Japanese *competitors,* the protection and expansion of their own vested interests." (My emphasis—P.N.) Instead of a "peace offensive," the Allies, the platform avers, continue to obliterate the civilian population of Germany by *bombing,* while the concords of Moscow and Teheran, "have revealed the basic outlines of the coming imperialist 'peace'" . . . "As totalitarian Russia emerges as the most powerful military force in Europe and Asia, Stalin moves to bring more and more of Europe under his direct or indirect control."

Word for word from the editorials in the defeatist and pro-fascist press; from speeches of those on trial for sedition in Washington!

A perusal of the platform and the resolutions adopted at the S.P. convention and of *The Call* of May 26 to July 14 reveals the *total absence* of such words as "Hitler" and "Hirohito." Nothing about the threat of Hitler and Hirohito to the security and the very national existence of the United States! Not a word about the ghastly gas chambers, the murder of millions of Jews, Poles, Russians! Nothing about the slaughter of the peoples of Europe and Asia! From the platform of the S.P., the articles in *The Call,* and the speeches of Norman Thomas it follows that *the main enemy is President Roosevelt,* alongside with "his great fellow rulers, Stalin and Churchill," as amended by Norman Thomas in *The Call* of May 26—in the best style of the appeaser press. Stalin, of course, comes in for a variety of savage attacks.

The S.P. convention took its stand against "total victory," or, to be more exact, *against victory.* It was a convention of defeatists. Norman Thomas, in his preconvention article in *The Call* of May 26, argues that "total victory" will not bring "total peace." He does not like the war on its "present terms." This was echoed by the keynoter of the convention, Maynard C. Krueger. "Prolongation of the war in its present terms," he stated, "is leading away from rather than toward lasting peace."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why? What is meant by "present terms"? Why will not victory bring peace? It is transparent enough that the S.P. leadership is smarting under the terms of the Teheran agreement which provided for the synchronized attack on Hitler from the East, West and South and for the continuation and acceleration of the bombing to which Norman Thomas objects so strenuously. However, one can fully understand why the language of the platform and the resolutions was not violent and specific enough for a substantial number of the convention delegates. There was a resolution before the convention *demanding that open and mass resistance to the war be organized.* Norman Thomas warned that that would be "a highly seditious proclamation." In view of the anger of the people toward the "Peace Now" movement led by his colleague George W. Hartman (as late as November, 1941, candidate for Mayor of the City of New York on the S.P. ticket), as well as in view of the sedition-trial in Washington, Norman Thomas was careful to conceal, in the platform and resolutions of the convention, the real meaning of the "immediate political peace offensive." Nevertheless, a minority Peace Now plank which was characterized by Thomas as "*unreservedly* generous to the Axis nations" received the votes of forty-two delegates, with eighty-three voting against it (My emphasis—P.N.).

One can see that the S.P. leadership took pains to camouflage its aims, both for legal reasons and for fear of the popular anger. There is, however, as seen above, enough in the S.P. platform and resolutions as well as in the writings and activities of Norman Thomas and other S.P. leaders, to make everybody realize the *pro-Axis* role of this leadership.

It is worth examining this role. It will give us the "theoretical" background for the sabotaging activities of the S.P. leadership directed at the "no-strike" policy of the American trade union movement. It will also help us understand the role of the Social-Democrat Vaino Tanner in Finland who is *openly* serving Hitler, or of Norman Thomas' much lamented colleagues, Ehrlich and Alter, who obtained their just punishment for their seditious activities in the war against Hitler.

* * *

Ever since Pearl Harbor Norman Thomas has conducted a violent struggle against all war measures, against every move to consolidate our anti-fascist national unity. He has attacked all war planning as "totalitarianism." (Harry Paxton Howard states in *The Call* of June 2 that there is a "mounting resentment against the restrictions associated with the war" and a "growing popular resentment toward the war.") Norman Thomas has bitterly rebuked the U. S. Government for banning the anti-Semitic, pro-Nazi *Social Justice.* In an article in the appeasement and anti-Roosevelt La Follette *Progressive* (Feb. 14) he came to the defense of Senator Wheeler, attacking those liberals who have stooped so low as to "re-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duce liberalism to hatred of Hitler." Thomas extols Wheeler's record of the "last quarter of a century" in order to protect the isolationist and appeasement activity of Wheeler and his defense of the indicted seditionists. "The name itself"—isolationist—is a "misnomer," according to Thomas.

The *Call* of January 15 was "happy" to print a letter of a certain Jo Cantine containing the following points: "If we don't like war, why must we keep on till we win it?"; "Now the Allies are in a position to negotiate (with Hitler) on equal terms"; "To the objection how can we trust Hitler, I would ask how can we trust anyone in war?" The writer concluded with the opinion that the war be treated in the manner certain people regarded the Eighteenth Amendment (Prohibition). . . . Treating the war in this manner, Norman Thomas took part in December, 1943, in the notorious Peace Movement conference held in Philadelphia, alongside with Mrs. Robert Taft, the Trotskyite A. J. Muste, Frederick Libby, and others who are openly working for a negotiated peace.

These few examples of the writings and activities of Norman Thomas and other S.P. leaders will help us understand the full meaning of the S.P. platform. There is a direct line from the speeches of Norman Thomas at the defeatist Peace conference to his present-day activities. In an article in the *Call* of May 26 (prior to the convention), along with Libby and Hartmann, he sees everything wrong in "total victory." He is very much afraid lest " 'total victory' will corrupt the victors." He cannot trust (along with Jo Cantine) "the present rulers of the United Nations." "What, then, is the answer in political terms?" he asks. And he answers:

"I wish that I could say that it is a simple demand for 'peace now,' but under present conditions I think that such a demand will be so widely understood or misunderstood as meaning appeasement of the war lords and a short truce rather than a peace, that it will tend to delay rather than to advance the winning of the earliest possible peace that will last."

The style of these quoted lines is burdened with the expedient of *legally* skirting sedition. Thomas is afraid he might be "misunderstood."

Thomas' call for a peace offensive which he would gladly call "Peace Now" came on the eve of the invasion of Europe. He laments the "tragedy" that no "peace offensive" preceded the invasion (for which he did *not* call in any of his writings and speeches and which was obviously not to his liking). A Peace Now offensive might have done away with the invasion altogether. . . .

At the time of that writing, the "danger" of an attack on Hitler's "Festung Europa" was already too real. Some S.P. leaders discovered it might be a good idea to give it an *anti-Stalin* angle. In that same issue of *The Call a* certain S.P. sage, André Martin, states that the second front "will have to break in the near future"—not in order to defeat Hitler and obliterate the danger of Hitlerism to the peoples of both

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hemispheres! The second front will have to be opened — "otherwise Stalin would become too powerful in Europe." It appears, therefore, that it was Stalin who tried to hold back the second front. . . .

Madness? There's method to it. The method was clearly delineated by Goebbels on the day of the invasion. The Berlin radio on that day made its bitterest attack on Stalin. This card, the attempt to divide the Allies, was played for all it was worth. The S.P. leadership continues to play that card, with a desperation born of defeat. The opening of the second front and the resultant strengthening of the concord of Teheran drive the S.P. leadership into a frenzy.

This savage and desperate anti-Soviet line called forth a protest from (presumably) a member of the Socialist Party, Ernie Crook of Hamburg, Iowa, who, in a letter to Norman Thomas printed in *The Call* of June 9, "cannot understand . . . why you . . . should be leaning over 'cheek by jowl' with Col. McCormick, Congressman Hamilton Fish, Martin Dies and Lawrence Dennis in throwing every suspicion on Russia and all things Russian." The resentment of an honest Socialist was answered by Thomas with another flood of vituperations against the Soviet Union and Stalin. President Roosevelt and Stalin, *not* Hitler and Hirohito, are the enemy, according to Norman Thomas!

In his answer to the Iowa Socialist Norman Thomas came closest to his statement in *The Call* of October 12, 1940, approvingly referring to Freda Utley's statement "that his [Stalin's] rule is even more cruel than Hitler's." Miss Utley, in her book *The Dream We Lost,* states (p. 321) that "German hegemony [over Europe] would be a boon to the Russian masses, if only because German National Socialism ensures the full development and utilization of resources and Stalin's National Socialism does not." At this stage, after the innumerable Lidices and after the Soviet's world-astounding development and utilization of resources, it is superfluous to refute this disgusting Nazi propaganda. Norman Thomas, in continuing his Hitlerite vilifications of the Soviet Union, must needs keep silent about the Lidices, avoid mentioning Stalingrad and lean over "cheek by jowl" with Col. McCormick and Co. in a common effort for a negotiated peace with Hitler.

The S.P. platform demands an armistice with the "peoples" of the Axis nations. This is the *lawyer's defense* put up by Harry Fleishman, Secretary of the S.P. But the term "people" as understood by the S.P. leadership is broad enough to include the Nazi Wehrmacht with its High Command and the Axis governments!

In *The Call* of June 23 Norman Thomas laments that there is a "growing tendency to speak of German and Japanese guilt." Mr. Thomas does not recognize any guilt even for a section of the German people. Without making any exceptions, he states that the German people have *"a very imperfect knowledge of the extent of horror of their government's atrocities, for instance in Poland."* Even the *sol-*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diers know little of these atrocities, Norman Thomas assures us on the authority of "an American, long a resident in the Balkans" (of the Mikhailovich type?).

Mr. Thomas is clearly out for a "soft peace," a negotiated peace. It is for this reason that the S.P. leadership has now launched a campaign to whitewash the Japanese government, no less! The resolution of the S.P. convention on "The War Against Japan and the Struggle Against Imperialism" (*The Call*, July 7) is aimed exclusively—*against the government of the United States!* It grants that the "immediate occasion" for the war was the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor—but! This attack, according to the resolution, was precipitated by an "ultimatum" by Secretary Hull "demanding the complete withdrawal from China while white imperialism was to remain unaffected." This shameless covering up of treason by an "anti-imperialist" twist is a desecration of any and all real struggles against imperialism and is truly in the style of the Tokyo broadcasts.

"*The [Roosevelt] Administration stands convicted*" is the sum total of this resolution on "The War Against Japan," which sounds like the pro-Japanese editorial in the New York *Daily News* immediately after the "famous" Oliver Lyttelton statement in London.

Norman Thomas picks up that statement in a letter to Secretary Hull printed in *The Call* of the same issue. Thomas repeats the story of the "ultimatum" in order to create the effect that Japan was *provoked* into the attack on Pearl Harbor. He asks whether the Roosevelt Administration was "*planning a military offensive against Japan at a time of its own choice,*" and delivers himself further of the following revealing sentence:

> "I raised it because it is important to know whether the Japanese were quite such inhuman monsters of treachery as we were led to believe."

Norman Thomas brazenly comes to the defense of the Japanese government! His heart, he assures us, bleeds over the rape of China, but —are the Japanese "such inhuman monsters of treachery as we were led to believe?"

(Be it remembered that in the years prior to Pearl Harbor when Japanese imperialism was plundering China, Norman Thomas was *against* an embargo on war materials to the Japanese militarists.)

What is the purpose of his letter to Secretary Hull? Why that resolution? Clearly, it is all part of the propaganda for a negotiated peace with Japan, with the Japanese militarist clique!

This is the meaning of the demand of the S.P. election platform for "an immediate political peace offensive based on an offer of an armistice." It is a *treasonable* platform offering an ideological base for the sabotage activities of the Thomas "Socialists" in the war industries, in alliance with the John L. Lewis camp and the Trotskyites.

* * *

The Call of June 2 is gleeful! "Detroit has been erupting in a se-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ries of strikes." The June 23 issue displays a cartoon against the no-strike pledge. The issue of the following week goes into raptures over the Boston convention of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, quoting extensively and with enthusiastic approval the defense of Lewis' anti-war strike policy and the attacks upon the President in the speech of the Trotskyite-Thomasite, Louis Nelson.

Again and again Roosevelt is presented as the main enemy. The S.P. election platform perfunctorily states that there is no choice between Roosevelt and a Republican candidate. The "tweedledum-tweedledee" theme is constantly repeated in the articles of Norman Thomas and others — a meaningless repetition of phrases which have no relation to reality, nay, a monstrous misrepresentation of the state of affairs! The wartime and post-war interests of the American nation and of the United Nations demand the *continuation* of the Roosevelt Administration. Roosevelt is pre-eminently the candidate of the people—transcending party affiliation —working, fighting, and dying to defeat the enemies of America and mankind and to preserve the peace. It is the proponents of a negotiated Hitler peace and the opponents of victory over fascism who have much to lose from the re-election of Roosevelt on November 7. The defeatist Thomas leadership of the S.P. knows full well that there is a world of difference between the two candidates. That is why it is doing its bit for the reactionary G.O.P. standard-bearer. That is why this pseudo-Socialist outfit is attacking Roosevelt with the ferocity of the Patterson-McCormick axis press!

Is it an accident that in its campaign to whitewash the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor *The Call* of June 23 prominently displays — of all things — a statement by Clare (GI Jim) Luce? . . . Did not Norman Thomas appear on the same platform with her ideological godfather, Hoover, at a meeting in Carnegie Hall, on Feb. 20, 1943, in support of the so-called campaign to feed the children of Europe? Did he not appear that same year together with Mrs. Robert Taft at the unsavory Peace Now convention in Philadelphia?

Along with Dewey, the Thomas leadership "grants" that the New Deal did something for the people, but it objects to the substitution of "Dr. Win-the-War" for "Mr. New Deal." The S.P. leadership has no use for the win-the-war slogan. The winning of the war requires the national unity of the American people. It is for the purpose of winning the war—its own war—that the labor movement gave its no-strike pledge!

The S.P. defeatist leaders claim Roosevelt has "betrayed" the New Deal, blithely forgetting the President's "New Bill of Rights," which goes much further than any New Deal reform in outlining an era of prosperity for the people.

The S.P. election platform and resolutions are larded with phrases about "economic security." The platform glibly states that the Communists extol "free enterprise," whereas a glimpse at Earl Browder's book *Teheran—Our Path in*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

War and in Peace can convince any *honest* Socialist that the issue is presented in context with the task of safeguarding economic security of the people after the war, under the conditions of capitalism—which will exist in the United States when the war is over. All the phrases about socialism will not save America from the most dreadful crisis if the program of *Teheran* is not put into effect. The road of the S.P. leadership leads to an era of—Hooverville.

Following the Republican convention Norman Thomas came out with a criticism of Dewey—which turned out to be again mainly an attack on Roosevelt! Like Hoover, who, in his speech at the Republican convention, referred to the articles of Forrest Davis in the *Saturday Evening Post* about Roosevelt's "Great Design," Thomas speaks of "President Roosevelt's 'great design'" as "an invitation to new war." (*The Call*, July 14.)

There is hardly a doubt that the S.P. campaign will be aimed primarily at Roosevelt, at the United Nations, at the concord of Teheran, thereby giving unmitigated service to the forces of Dewey and the appeasers and defeatists generally. Not among the least of these services will be—or, rather, is—the campaign of the Thomasites and Trotskyites for a "third party." It is not for nothing that in Michigan, where there is a concentration of defeatists and Coughlinite pro-Hitlerites, a movement for an anti-Roosevelt third party, the Commonwealth Party, was started, with the aid of anti-Sovieteers from the Canadian Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. The third-party campaign of the Thomasites and Trotskyites is closely linked with the Peace Now movement and other sinister forces. A meeting of an "Institute of International Relations" in Seattle, addressed by Maynard C. Krueger and the Trotskyite Bertram Wolfe, ended with the arrest of one Gordon Kiyoshi Hirabayashi. The Washington State C.I.O. called on the Department of Justice to take action against the treasonous activities of the defeatist "peace movement." The Washington State A. F. of L. *Labor News* called for a struggle against the "peace movement" termites. Types like Hirabayashi are merely tools of the Thomas leadership of the S.P. and of the Trotskyites who are supplying the "theory" for sabotage and treason, covering it up with "Socialist" phrases, just as Vaino Tanner is doing in Finland, De Mann in Belgium, and Paul Faure in France.

The danger of these pseudo-"Socialists" should in no sense be minimized. Especially when the outlook is for very close elections, the work of this small but insidious group can, if not effectively checked, create costly confusion, especially in such important states as Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut, where Norman Thomas henchmen have wormed their way into key positions in certain places in the labor movement. It should be borne in mind that, utterly out of proportion to the puniness of his outfit, Norman Thomas is getting systematic support from the press as well as national radio hook-ups,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obviously through influences that seek the defeat of Roosevelt in the elections. The people, and labor especially, must be fully alert to the menace of this divisive camp and crush it in time.

The honest Socialists will side with their comrades in France, Italy, and Yugoslavia, who are part of the national unity in the struggle against the enemy — Hitlerism. In the words of the Italian Communist Togliatti: *"There is no more revolutionary act than to destroy Hitler."* The honest Socialists in the United States will be on the side of the labor movement and the entire people, on the side of the American and British and Canadian boys in France, Italy and the Pacific, on the side of the Red Army, in the struggle to destroy fascism, to safeguard the Teheran program of lasting peace and prosperity, by electing Franklin D. Roosevelt on November 7.

* * *

In addition to unmasking their hostility to the Teheran program and their pro-Hitler peace-offensive, we Communists have the special responsibility of exposing the demagogic line and disruptive, anti-unity anti-United Nations activities of the Norman Thomas camp calculated to win support among sincere workers and progressives as the "exponent" of the cause of labor, as "friend" of the Negro people, of India and all colonial peoples. We have the task of showing why the discredited Thomas camp frantically seeks to deck itself out with the bunting of "socialism." They, whose hatred of actualized socialism of the first socialist state, is no less venomous than Hitler's hatred, seek to make of socialism, which is not a practical issue in the United States today, or in the immediate post-war period, a wedge of division between the forces both of national unity and of the United Nations.

It is the task of the Communists, the Marxists of America, to expose these socialist pretenses, to clarify these issues for the masses, for the Leftward moving workers, for all honest liberals. It is our task patiently and convincingly to fortify the workers and all progressive forces with the understanding that the Socialist Party is in opposition to the interests and policies of the overwhelming majority of labor and the nation; that the road forward for the working class and the nation lies along the path of national unity, for decisive victory over fascism, for enduring peace, for the full realization of the objectives of Teheran.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TROTSKYITE FIFTH COLUMN IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT

BY GEORGE MORRIS

TODAY, as the coordinated offensives of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition mount to new fury and the war of liberation is at its supreme moment, Trotskyites step up their strike-provoking activity and home-front sabotage.

At factories or outside union meetings, workers come upon them handing out innocent-looking leaflets vigorously proclaiming their concern for grievances but assuring us that a strike is the only solution.

They set themselves against the position of all labor, that the greatest strike of all time is being waged against fascism. With "socialist"-sounding phrases and fire-eating "revolutionism" they would turn labor's traditional strike weapon into a means of scabbing upon the titanic liberation struggle humanity is waging.

It is not sufficient to view the work of the Trotskyites simply on the basis of their obvious acts against the war effort. There is a motive behind their anti-war strike policy, and it isn't concern with the welfare of the workers. We must know the cesspool of treachery from which they draw their entire program.

Trotskyite Activity in America

Numerically, the Trotskyites are very few. They have no influential personalities in their midst, and no mass base anywhere, save for several local unions in which they are still trying to cultivate one. Obviously, it is unjust to class all wartime strikes as Trotskyite-led, or strikers as Trotskyites.

Trotskyites distribute their very limited forces through several key war production centers — Detroit, Akron, Buffalo, Newark, the borough of Queens in New York; in several steel centers, airplane, shipbuilding, rubber, and other points of advantage. The initial step of their operators is to find some union official to cultivate into a Charlie McCarthy. It is usually a Red-baiter or a fellow with more ambition than support among the workers.

Their program is to utilize every opportunity, even the smallest grievance, to violate the no-strike pledge; oppose the President at every turn; favor the creation of political split-offs in labor ranks under the guise of favoring a "labor party" but actually to weaken Roosevelt support; ridicule and un-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dermine national unity or joint management-labor committees; oppose or weaken Allied War Aid (as they succeeded in doing at Ford Instrument, Long Island City); and thwart labor's no-strike pledge. Their approach is highly demagogic. Most workers neither know the Trotskyites' history of treachery nor suspect that their interest in "grievances" is to sabotage the war effort.

While the Trotskyites are the most brazen and most conscious defeatists in labor ranks, they also have some very close allies. In addition to James P. Cannon's Trotskyite group, which publishes *The Militant,* there are two split-offs—one around the paper *Labor Action,* and another with a center in Chicago. Norman Thomas' Socialist Party follows a war policy that is hardly distinguishable from theirs. In addition, they have close relations with some groups among the Social-Democrats for common anti-Soviet and Red-baiting purposes. David Dubinsky's garment union machine is going all-out in the campaign to free the eighteen Trotskyites imprisoned for sedition in Minneapolis. Samuel Wolchock, head of the C.I.O.'s retail union, a Dubinsky associate, is backing the Trotskyites and is using quite a number of them as organizers. Several Social-Democratic leaders of the Textile Workers Union are defending the imprisoned Trotskyites.

On most specific trade union issues they work closely with the John L. Lewis camp and such groups as the Ku Klux Klan may have in a given situation, as in some auto plants in Michigan. Conventions of the United Automobile Workers, at least the last two, offered a panoramic view of the way these groups operate as a united front. They have all found the U.A.W. a happy hunting ground, thanks to a factionalism which they exploit and keep alive, and thanks to certain inexperienced or unstable local leaders.

The main targets of their slanderous leaflets and paper are C.I.O. President Philip Murray, and Presidents R. J. Thomas of the U.A.W., Sherman Dalrymple, of the Rubber Workers, Harry Bridges of the Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Joseph Curran of the National Maritime Union, Daniel J. Tobin of the A. F. of L.'s Brotherhood of Teamsters, and other leaders who stand vigorously against violation of the no-strike pledge.

Just as defeatists and Republicans are slandering the President's Administration as a "bureaucracy," so the Trotskyites apply the same name-calling against those leaders who uphold the no-strike pledge. Their line is clearly seen from such statements as the one in a recent editorial in their treason-sheet *The Militant:*

"The fight to rescind the no-strike pledge is . . . intimately bound up with the struggle for internal union democracy."

Union democracy to the Trotskyites is freedom for saboteurs of the war effort. A few examples will illustrate how the Trotskyites work:

The following telling incident occurred on the very day on which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pearl Harbor was bombed. A membership meeting of the U.A.W. locals in Bell Aircraft, Buffalo, was debating a strike vote. Several Trotskyites who had worked their way into key spots in the local felt everything was going their way. It was on the eve of the strike vote that someone rushed in with the news of the Pearl Harbor bombing. The Trotskyites were not affected one whit. Their leader rose and shouted "Pearl Harbor or no Pearl Harbor, we strike anyway." Of course, he got nowhere with his demagogy.

A grievance may be small and easily settled in a conference. But the Trotskyites would rather have thousands on strike over a trivial matter. Such was the case at the Johnsville, Pa., plant of the Brewster Aeronautical Corp. The issue was the status of coast guardsmen that the Navy gave to about a score of plant guards who were members of the union. The issue was whether Navy discipline could apply to them. Thomas De Lorenzo, president of the U.A.W. local in the plant and willing tool of the Trotskyites, pulled out 6,000 workers for an entire week over the issue. He was unsuccessful in an effort to involve the Long Island City main plant.

A jurisdictional dispute served as an ideal opening for a small local of Wolchock's retail union in Detroit. The union disputed with the A. F. of L. teamsters over collective bargaining rights covering a couple of hundred of bottle deliverers. Appealing to U.A.W. locals for sympathy, Trotskyites and Socialists in Chrysler plant locals responded by ejecting A. F. of L. deliverers from their plants. The ejectors were fired by the company. The upshot was a strike throwing over 11,000 Chrysler workers into idleness.

A. F. of L. teamster unions quickly decided to call out a general strike of all 45,000 Michigan truck drivers. The "soda-pop" war, threatening to embroil all Michigan labor in a jurisdictional dispute, was narrowly averted when responsible leaders stepped in. The provocateurs were Trotskyite leaders in Wolchock's employ.

Another Trotskyite group is entrenched in Wolchock's Montgomery Ward local in Chicago. A Trotskyite attorney who wrote a pamphlet against the Moscow trials and visited Trotsky in Mexico is the leading sprit there. Their main object was to get strike sanction from Wolchock, which they received. Their paper boasted that this was the first case of a strike sanctioned by a C.I.O. union since Pearl Harbor. The company's main object, too, despite deceptive gestures, was to bring about a strike situation and the consequent plant seizure. Sewell Avery, president of the company, a notorious America Firster, admitted to a Congressional committee that his object was to "dramatize" public opposition to the Roosevelt Administration. Mr. Avery's desire to be carried out of Montgomery Ward offices, as was so well shown in the much publicized photograph for which he posed so willingly, was part of this anti-Roosevelt "drama." We have already seen how Republicans are exploiting the confusion around the Ward case and how the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor-baiters have pressed for new anti-labor legislation.

The general line of the Trotskyites is to furnish the "labor" side of strike provocations. Some companies are giving them all the encouragement they need by procrastinating negotiations, or by suddenly scrapping union conditions. The apparently agreed-upon plan of the most reactionary employers to defy War Labor Board decisions for membership maintenance is a godsend to the Trotskyites.

Recent months have given evidence that labor is becoming more than ever aware of the real nature of Trotskyites. They have been rooted out of several organizations where they have operated for some time. They have been cleaned out of Bell Aircraft and several locals of the steelworkers' union and other unions in the Buffalo area. Also, they have been cleaned out of the Lorain, Ohio, steelworkers' union, where they played a menacing role for some time, as they have been pretty much removed from positions in most locals of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers. The crushing defeat they met early in July in the elections of the Federal Drydock and Shipbuilding Corporation, Local 16 of the I.U.M.S.W., is especially indicative of the growing consciousness in labor ranks of their role.

In placing a defiant local in Cleveland under receivership Philip Murray served notice that he would not tolerate the doings of the Trotskyites in the steel union. R. J. Thomas served similar notice when he removed the leadership of Chrysler Local 490 for violating the no-strike pledge. In Los Angeles the C.I.O. council put a ban upon the Trotskyites and their publications. The Buffalo C.I.O. Council called upon the F.B.I. to investigate them, as a convention of the shipbuilding workers had asked on a previous occasion.

After all their efforts, the Trotskyites remain without a mass base. In a number of locals, as at Brewster Aeronautical; Ford Instrument, Long Island City; Briggs Manufacturing, Detroit; and in several retail locals, people who front for them are still in the leadership; but there is no case of substantial direct support for the Trotskyites and their anti-war program.

Most symbolic of the awareness that is developing in labor ranks of the role of the Trotskyites is the lesson learned by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its President Daniel Tobin. There were days when Mr. Tobin referred to Trotskyites confusedly as some sort of "faction" in the ranks of Communists. But today he sees them as an international menace to the Allied anti-Hitler cause.

Declaring that the I.B.T. is "proud of its stand in behalf of Russia," an editorial in the May, 1944, issue of the *International Teamster* took pride in the fact that the union "crushed Trotsky's move aimed at Joseph Stalin." It went on to describe how the Trotskyites sought to establish a base in the I.B.T. in Minneapolis.

"When this attempt was made your international officials did everything in their power to prevent such organization from func-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tioning and collecting sums of money from our membership, to be used against Joseph Stalin.

"We know of no other labor union in America that did likewise, although undoubtedly there must have been some members of this outfit within several other international unions."

Mr. Tobin challenges other unions to do likewise. The July issue of the *International Teamster* goes all-out against the Trotskyite menace, and observes that the Minneapolis experience was re-enacted in Detroit's "soda-pop" war. Wolchock is vigorously denounced for tolerating these provocateurs in his union.

The lesson learned by the teamsters is very significant. In earlier days its officials attacked the Communists, citing their experience with the contemptible Trotskyites as the ground. Today they realize the difference. The July issue of the *International Teamster* reprints a substantial section of this writer's column in the *Daily Worker* exposing the Trotskyites.

The straightforward stand of this union that Trotskyites are on par with enemy spies and saboteurs and should be treated as such is a timely advice to other organizations. The labor movement has already suffered much discredit and adverse legislation because of an underestimation of the Trotskyite menace. At this moment, when reaction and defeatism are banking so much on provocations to bring about confusion as we near the election and the postwar period, the Trotskyites could be particularly dangerous. No one can truthfully claim to be patriotic and in favor of an Allied victory and at the same time give shelter to these saboteurs of the war effort.

Out of Their Own Mouths

Notwithstanding the fact that labor, almost everywhere, has repudiated the Trotskyites, they have been able to obtain some cover and comfort from certain liberal quarters and even a few labor leaders through their appeal in behalf of the eighteen imprisoned seditionists at Minneapolis.

It would be as incorrect as it is false to view this case as a "civil liberties" question. The issue of these jailed Trotskyites must be viewed from the standpoint of our nation's win-the-war program, of combating every effort to sabotage the war effort or to confuse and divide the people and the labor movement. The activities of the Trotskyites are part and parcel of the efforts of the defeatist and pro-fascist camp as a whole to disrupt the drive for victory.

Those who have followed the history of the Trotskyites know well how their work at every stage has dovetailed perfectly into the general objectives of the Axis powers. We need only recall their campaign against efforts to achieve collective security against Hitler. They did everything in their power to disrupt the anti-fascist people's front in every country where it asserted itself and in those countries where progress toward it was made. Notably, in the civil war in Spain, where they followed a policy of disrupting the Loyalist anti-fascist forces and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strengthening Franco, we saw a perfect example of their treacherous policy in action.

Who are these people who have transplanted Trotskyite treachery to American soil; who, both before and since Pearl Harbor, have served as Hitler's fifth column in the labor movement? Let us examine their program as it came off their own tongues during the Minneapolis trial. The group on trial included the principal leaders of the Trotskyites: James P. Cannon, their attorney Albert Goldman, Vincent Dunne, and others who had been in close contact with Trotsky in Mexico until his death.

The government cited numerous documents, resolutions and speeches of the Trotskyites as their leader Cannon was on the witness stand. All of them were fully confirmed by the Trotskyites as expressions of their line. The court transcript is being brazenly distributed by them today in pamphlets as their program in opposing the war effort.

One of the resolutions read to Cannon by the prosecutor declared that in the event the United States enters directly into the war the Socialist Workers Party, as the Trotskyites call their outfit, will utilize the war situation "to prosecute the class struggle with the utmost intransigeance . . . to bring the war to a close by the revolutionary overturn of capitalism. . . ."

"Yes, that is a clear statement of our aims," replied Cannon. "We are going to oppose the war. We are going to speak against it."

A second document, which Cannon said gave the view of the Trotskyites, declared that the S.W.P. "will not under any circumstances support that war but, on the contrary, will fight against it." Cannon confirmed the Trotskyite stand that they "will advocate the continuation of the class struggle during the war regardless of the consequence for the outcome of the American military struggle."

Cannon gave this as the Trotskyite position to the court on November 21—sixteen days before Pearl Harbor, when many of our ships and seamen had been sent to the bottom by Nazi torpedoes! Since then we have seen how closely the Trotskyites follow that line—how absolutely unconcerned they are "of the consequences for the outcome of the American military struggle" and how hopefully they look for a long and difficult war and a "war crisis."

Another of the produced documents declared that the Trotskyites call for "fraternization" during the war of "soldier with soldier on the opposite side of the battle front: we mobilize the women and youth against the war; we carry on constant, persistent, tireless preparation of the revolution—in the factories, in the mills, in the villages, in the barracks, at the front and in the fleet."

To this Cannon replied: "Yes, I think that is a summation of the idea, for the soldiers and everybody to do that. That's the way to put an end to this slaughter."

Amplifying a bit more, Goldman, in his summary speech before the court, just ten days before Pearl Harbor, said that the Trotskyites are "realistic enough to understand

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that in the Army it is necessary to be cautious. Just as a trade unionist in an open shop has to be careful. . . ." And he added: "The greatest open shop institution in the country is the United States Army."

This is the Trotskyite view of our army now advancing in the anti-Hitler coalition to crush fascism! The Trotskyites are defiantly peddling this program today in opposition to the program of labor and the nation with 2,750,000 trade unionists in the armed forces. Thousands of local unions have special committees to keep in touch with their members in the services, to encourage them to be loyal to the country. The soldiers are told how labor is doing all it can on the home front to assure and speed victory.

The seditionists Cannon, Goldman & Co. would like locals to write letters to their members urging them to "fraternize" with the Nazi hordes, not to drive for their extermination, as they are doing so effectively.

All this service to Hitler is lavishly decorated with phrases that make it appear so "socialist"-like. But there is nothing new in that. We know well how Hitler found it good policy to incorporate the word "Socialist" in the name of his party of fascist murderers. Hitler rants against "international bankers" and "plutocratic capitalism." There is no more socialism in Trotskyism than in the program and deeds of the National-Socialist Party.

Perhaps the most interesting of the trial testimony and indicative of the efforts of Trotskyites to give their fifth-column work a "socialist" slant is the formula they revealed to the court for "defeating" Hitler. The first step in the Trotskyite plan, according to Goldman, is to drop the war effort and establish a "socialist" government. Then:

"Socialist governments in England and the United States would proclaim to the German people: 'We have nothing against you; all we want is that you join us in creating a cooperative commonwealth throughout the world. We have no ambitions against your territory and we shall not do anything to deprive you of your liberty: revolt against Hitler and establish your own socialist government.'

"Hitler could not last one week after such an appeal. He would be destroyed by his own people. This is our solution to the problem of Hitlerism."

It is as simple as that. Just one good broadcast to the German people and presto, it'll all be over! Indeed, hadn't the very existence of a socialist Soviet Union halted the Hitler invasion?

But Goldman admits that the influence of the Trotskyites is not quite strong enough for this formula, so, like Hitler, he banks on a long war, "five or more years." And he has confidence that difficulties, starvation, dissatisfaction and sharp struggles will develop to ever greater heights.

The Cesspool From Which It Came

What we have seen of the Trotskyite program in "theory" and practice is only an American version of their fifth-column work. The picture is the same in every country where they have a group. Recently

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their leaders in England were arrested and jailed for efforts to provoke pre-invasion strikes. The sentence of the court voiced the verdict of British labor. To get at the cesspool from which their treacherous activity flows it will be instructive to hark back to the trials of the Trotskyites at Moscow in 1936-37.

The world has learned much since those trials, and learned at great cost. Many are the leaders and statesmen who look back and say: "If we had only realized in time the full significance of what those trials revealed." The degeneration of the Trotskyites to the role of spies, saboteurs and would-be Quislings for Nazi Germany and Japan's imperialists was only one aspect of the evidence at the trials. The other was disclosure of the extent to which the practical phases of Hitler's plans had already advanced.

Unfortunately, instead of drawing the proper conclusions, and preparing to meet the onslaught, many government heads, statesmen, liberals and even labor leaders, swallowed the Goebbels' line of Soviet-baiting and joined the chorus of defenders of the Trotskyites.

But in the years that passed many prominent leaders in capitalist lands spoke up and admitted the great mistake. Some of them have spoken out bluntly and unequivocally, as did ex-Ambassador Joseph E. Davies to Moscow, who witnessed the trials. Mr. Davies' book, *Mission to Moscow*, and the great film based upon it, both of which received popular acclaim in many countries, are the best testimony to this changed attitude.

Far more than straightening out historic accounts is involved here, however. We recall that period because an understanding of the real nature of Trotskyites is extremely urgent today if the nature of their work in the midst of war is to be understood. The liquidation of the Trotskyite wreckers in the Soviet Union, as is so well appreciated throughout the anti-fascist world today, has deprived Hitler of that fifth column that he found so helpful in all other lands he invaded. But Trotskyism is not yet crushed in many parts of the world. On the contrary, as in the United States, it is still enjoying aid and comfort from some confused and shallow-minded liberals and shelter in some union circles.

Trotskyites capitalize on the forgetfulness of people, especially in the whirlwind of events of recent years. Also, they take refuge in the belief among many people that Trotskyism is something that was entirely based on Soviet soil and nothing remained of it when the accused met their fate, and after Trotsky's death in Mexico.

The Trotskyites on the Moscow witness stand themselves described most revealingly how their crimes were a direct outcome of their basic theory that socialism cannot be built in one country. On that basis they refused to acknowledge the swift advance of socialism in the Soviet Union, the immense new strength that it was acquiring through the Five-Year Plans, and turned to wrecking activity.

Karl Radek, one of Trotsky's chief confederates on trial, said that Trot-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sky summed up his position to him as follows:

"There is no socialism in the Soviet Union. . . . It is merely capitalist industrialism. . . . War against the Soviet Union is inevitable. The Soviet government will be defeated. Therefore, concessions must be made by the Trotskyites who will come into power, to Hitler and Japan, and then the Revolution will begin anew."

The entire perspective of the Trotskyites rested on a conviction that fascism will sweep into power, that labor everywhere would be smashed and rendered impotent for many years. It was, consequently, a "revolutionary" strategy to make a deal with Hitler and thereby "save" the revolution which Stalin "betrayed." Under this fantastic perspective, Trotsky laid out a policy of wrecking activity, assassination of Soviet leaders and all else that would *hasten developments toward war* so that the "revolution" could be "saved." This policy was integrated, through negotiations, with the plan of Hitler's High Command. At the same time, the Trotskyites prepared themselves to hand over to Hitler the Ukraine and exploitation rights in the Soviet Union and to serve as Quislings in the Kremlin. In the light of this absurd idea for a "new lease" for socialism, there is nothing surprising in the agreement negotiated between Trotsky and Rudolph Hess, Hitler's deputy, as revealed in the trial.

Piatakov, Trotsky's first lieutenant inside the Soviet Union, related the Trotsky-Hess deal as follows:

"He [Trotsky] then told me that he had conducted rather lengthy negotiations with the vice-chairman of the National-Socialist Party—Hess. . . . What, properly speaking, does this agreement amount to if formulated briefly? First, the German fascists promise to adopt a favorable attitude toward the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc and to support it if it comes to power either in time of war, or before a war, should it succeed in doing so. But in return the fascists are to receive the following compensation: a general favorable attitude toward German interests and toward the German government on all questions of international policy; certain territorial concessions would have to be made, and these territorial concessions have been defined—in particular, mention was made of territorial concessions in a veiled form which were called non-resisting Ukrainian national-bourgeois forces in the event of their self-determination. . . .

"The next point of the agreement dealt with the form in which German capital would be enabled to exploit in the Soviet Union the raw material resources it needs. It concerned the exploitation of gold mines, oil, manganese forests, apatites, etc.

"In short, it was agreed in principle between Trotsky and Hess that German capital would be allowed to come in and obtain the necessary economic complement but the definite forms which this was to assume would evidently be worked out later."

This political testimony of the trial was well supported with a mountain of evidence of direct sabotage activities. Trotskyites, effectively covering themselves up with pre-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tence of loyalty to the country—Zinoviev even writing an obituary of assassinated Kirov although he himself had participated in the crime — wormed their way into many important posts. From those vantage points they directed wrecking of machines, derailment of trains, dynamiting of mines, and such other useful activity for Hitler. The accused explained that one of the major objectives was to rouse dissatisfaction among the workers.

Piatakov, reporting regarding the same conference, described how furious Trotsky was because wrecking activity had not yet reached the desired proportions. He charged his confederates with not realizing how near decisive events were. Trotsky evidently knew this much better than most European statesmen.

From the Moscow Courts to Minneapolis

Piecing together the program of Trotskyism as it was unfolded in the Minneapolis court, we can see how it flows directly from the program of Trotsky as it was brought out by his confederates in the Moscow courts. Trotsky's followers have here adjusted his program to conditions that face them in America and in the midst of the war. Stripped of all its demagogic nonsense, it comes down to a program of service to Hitler and sabotage of the war effort. Their starting point, which brings them into a chorus with Hitler and Goebbels, is characterizing our war of national liberation as an "imperialist war" no different than the first world war. With that as a base, it is convenient for them to take cover under much of what Lenin outlined as a socialist policy during World War I. They merely leave out of account the distinction that Lenin made between a just war which workers should support and a war that involves only the predatory interests of ruling groups. That puts them along a path of opposition to everything that the workers and the nation should and do favor in this war.

The formula fits Hitler's interest like a glove. It justifies opposition to a victory for "any" government (they are screaming for a soft peace); it sneers at America's national interest; national unity, labor-management collaboration on production, primary consideration to the war effort and settlement of all disputes peacefully, are considered as "betrayal" of labor's interest under this formula.

The army is an "open shop" to them—solely a sphere within which to "work cautiously" in search for loopholes to disrupt. The Trotskyites regret the Army's good food conditions no less than does Hitler.

Working directly under Trotsky's personal coaching, and themselves old and very cynical hands at their game, the Trotskyites on trial were not so stupid as their formula to overthrow Hitler in a week sounds. But this is the sort of hash they have to throw in to furnish something that sounds as though they are socialists and against Hitler. The real part of their program, the part that calls for *action,* is against America's war effort, and is naturally as pleasing to Hitler as the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agreement Trotsky and Hess worked out.

The Trotskyites claimed in court that they are opposed to acts of sabotage. So far, in this war, they were not accused of such acts. One explanation for that is in statements from the F.B.I. pointing out that acts of sabotage are comparatively few in this war.

Effective vigilance is a factor. But it is also clear that wrecking can take on for Hitler a more effective form. Downright material wrecking would inevitably bring a general crackdown upon all Axis-line elements in America, something we really never had. The poisonous activity of the native fascist and other defeatist forces in the country is far more useful to Hitler than wrecking of plants. In that sphere, the Trotskyites perform the function of specialists in labor's ranks.

The defendants at Minneapolis had, of course, a basis for complaining that other subversive elements were not brought to trial. It is a matter of the most serious hindrance to our victory drive that fifth columnists should so long have been left at large. Only now has the government put twenty-nine native fascists and Bundists on trial under the same anti-sedition act.

Roger Baldwin, director of the Civil Liberties Union, recently told a Trotskyite audience that the Minneapolis prisoners and the twenty-nine tried at Washington have a common struggle to fight for invalidation of the Anti-Sedition Act. He added that the A.C.L.U. would be equally interested in the appeal of the Washington trial to a high court as it was interested in the unsuccessful appeal of the eighteen Trotskyites. The Baldwin crowd has become a shelter for fascists and Trotskyites. The same Baldwin who rushed to aid Gerald L. K. Smith to obtain a meeting hall, the same Baldwin who announced his opposition to laws barring anti-Semitic and racist material from the mails, is also defending the Trotskyites. Exposure of Trotskyites also brings with it exposure of those who aid and shelter them. True anti-fascism is absolutely incompatible with support of these Axis collaborators.

Thus we see that Trotskyites, stripped of their demagogy, are fascism's fifth column in the labor movement. They cover up their treacherous line with deceitful methods, a pretence to be "militantly" concerned in the welfare of the workers. At every step of their path, before and after the war, they have always found a formula that served reaction and fascism. Militant-sounding phrases to trim such policy make it all the more harmful. Labor can no more tolerate Trotskyites in its ranks than any fascists and provocateurs.

At this crucial stage of the war, when it is so essential to maintain solid national unity behind it, the Trotskyites, although few in number, can be extremely dangerous to everything that labor and the nation hold dear. No quarter to the Trotskyites is an integral part of the slogan: no quarter to the Hitlerite fifth column. Labor owes it to itself and the nation to help sweep these helpmates of fascism from the road to victory.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CUBAN ELECTIONS

BY BLAS ROCA

General Secretary of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba

ON JUNE 2, at twelve o'clock noon, Dr. Carlos Saladrigas, presidential candidate of the Socialist-Democratic Coalition, gave to the press a brief statement acknowledging that the first electoral returns appeared to indicate a victory for his opponent, Dr. Grau San Martin. This incident occasioned an unfeigned surprise, not alone in Cuba, but abroad as well, where the Cuban election campaign had been followed with close attention. It was the first time, in Cuba, that a presidential candidate put forward by the parties supporting the government had admitted the triumph of his adversary by a simple declaration, without making the slightest effort to alter the result of the balloting.

This was the first cause of surprise in Cuba, the history of whose elections is filled with instances of intimidation, chicanery, and other devious methods. For the first time in the history of our country the government had presided with an absolute impartiality over the choice of a president and had proclaimed a victory for the opposition before the official results were known.

The greatest surprise of all, however, was occasioned by the fact that Dr. Grau San Martin actually had a majority of the votes, sufficient to elect him President of the Republic; for no serious observer of the political scene, either in Cuba or abroad, could logically have expected that he would win. Everything, on the contrary, led one to think that the Socialist-Democratic Coalition would emerge victorious; the total membership of its affiliated parties, the number of votes those parties had obtained in the partial elections of 1942, and the adherence of a number of leaders of Grau's Autentico Party to the Coalition since then—all pointed to the supposition of such a mass electorate behind it that, in spite of his personal drawing-power, Dr. Grau would never be able to defeat Dr. Saladrigas.

All such calculations were to prove fallacious that second day of June, when the returns showed a slight majority in favor of Dr. Grau in at least five provinces. He had carried five provinces, while the Socialist-Democratic Coalition had won a senatorial majority in four out of the six provinces that make

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up the island, and had elected at least forty-five out of seventy representatives to the Chamber. That is to say, the Socialist-Democratic Coalition had won a parliamentary majority while losing the presidential election.

As the days went by, with the results at the polls still not fully known, interested commentators began "explaining" the causes of this defeat of the C.S.D.'s* presidential candidate. None of them made any serious and documented study of the election returns; they were, simply, seeking arguments to suit their purpose, their chief argument being that the unfavorable vote for the head of the C.S.D. ticket showed an anti-Communist reaction on the part of public opinion. In reality, this "explanation" is designed to obscure the real character of the electoral struggle which has just taken place in our country, by concealing the true causes of Dr. Grau's victory. Above all, these commentators employ the anti-Communist argument with the purpose, on the one hand, of bringing pressure to bear upon the new president to pursue a reactionary and anti-popular path, and, on the other hand, of breaking up the unity of the Coalition, with the object of incorporating some of its parties into the new government.

It is not worth while answering such false arguments as these in detail. What is important is: to make an analysis of the principal factors that led to a victory for the opposition candidate. Such an analysis will not only serve as the best answer to the interested arguments of the anti-Communists and Falangist reactionaries; it will further enable us to draw the greatest amount of profit from the experiences of this electorial campaign, and make it possible for us to appreciate the true character and meaning of the returns, thus providing the basis for a better orientation toward those political events which are to come.

Why is it that the Socialist-Democratic Coalition, winning the national elections on the parliamentary field, should have failed to elect a president? It is not possible to answer this question by citing a single factor as the determining one in the defeat; for these elections were the most complicated in character of any ever held in Cuba, and the determining factors were correspondingly varied and highly complex.

For the first time the new electoral system established by the Constitution of 1940 was functioning in our country, in accordance with which the voter casts a direct and independent ballot for each office. This means that for the first time he could vote for the presidential candidate of one party, for one or more senators of another party, the candidate for representative of a third party, and the same for governor, mayor, and councilman. That is to say, each could vote for as many parties as there were offices. For the first time, also, compulsory voting was in effect, and this, under the threat of penalties, brought to the polls an enormous number of citizens without definite political

* These initials stand for Coalicion Socialista Democratica (Socialist-Democratic Coalition).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinions, who, in the casting of their ballots, were motivated by the most varied and contradictory stimuli. Basically, it is to this new electoral system that we must look for the determining factors in the defeat of the Coalition's presidential nominee. Had the Electoral Code in force up to 1940 been still in effect, it is probable that Saladrigas and not San Martin would have won out.

Taking into account these circumstances, what, then, were the principal factors in the defeat of the Socialist-Democratic Coalition so far as the presidency is concerned? As we see it, those factors are seven in number:

1. The form of accord between the Coalitionist candidates;

2. The lack of unity in the C.S.D.;

3. The lack of a clear and definite program, whereas the opposition had a number of impressive slogans;

4. The tolerance shown toward the provocations of certain elements of the opposition;

5. The indecision of the government with respect to a set of basic problems and the cleverness of the opposition in exploiting that indecision;

6. The irritation produced among the masses by those hardships created by the war and by speculation;

7. The bad propaganda of the C.S.D.

Let us endeavor to explain each one of these seven factors which went to produce the results of the first of June.

I. The Manner in Which the Coalitionist Slate Was Formed

It was only after an intensive struggle between the two principal parties, the Liberal Party and the Democratic Party, a struggle lasting about a year and a half, that the C.S.D. was able to agree upon a presidential candidate. This struggle, by reason of the form which it assumed in the course of its development, proved detrimental to the candidate selected, aroused in the rank and file of the Liberal Party a feeling of opposition to him, and rendered extraordinarily difficult the intensive mobilization of the masses around the candidacy of Dr. Carlos Saladrigas. This factor assumes all the greater importance if we take into account the present mode of balloting, with the executive offices separated from the others and with a direct and specific ballot required for each.

The opposition had an enormous advantage here, in that it did not have to go looking for a presidential candidate. Even before the Autentico-Republican Alliance had been formed, they had an indisputable candidate, a ready-made one, with a popularity extending over the past ten years and dating in particular from the electoral campaign of 1940. For it was in reality the figure of Dr. Grau San Martin that constituted the axis of the opposing coalition; Dr. Grau, for reasons that we will show later, exerted a great attraction, politically, over the broad masses of the voters, and the opposition was thereby enabled to rally them under his banner.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the C.S.D., on the other hand, there were at the least a dozen possible candidates. No sooner were the partial elections of March, 1942, over than aspirants from the various Coalition parties began to spring up, and there ensued a strenuous fight to determine from which of the two major parties the presidential nominee should be chosen. This fight became a bitter one. The disruption of the Democratic Party put an end there to the open struggle between rival candidates, leaving Saladrigas as the outstanding figure and the possible standard-bearer of the C.S.D. Within the Liberal Party, however, there remained numerous aspirants, who many times stooped to noisy and unrestrained campaign tactics against the one who appeared to have the best chance of being nominated, while on all sides there was an effort to exalt the opposition candidate, by way of "putting fear into the C.S.D." This party, with great fanfare, began a most intensive agitation under the slogan of Liberal Power. The rank and file, rallied under this slogan—one which many of its proponents knew to be predestined to defeat—accordingly felt cheated when the campaign ended with the nomination by the Liberals of Dr. Saladrigas, Chairman of the Democratic Party.

It was to the accompaniment of such a struggle as this that the inter-party affiliations were worked out, a struggle that became a truly violent one, in the course of which certain of the Coalitionists sought to depict Saladrigas as the Palace Guard candidate, the man who would impose Batista, and as an aspirant wholly lacking in either personal merit or popular appeal. Even in February, when the affiliations had already been effected, the presidential candidate did not appear in the eyes of the people and of the rank and file of the constituent parties as having been decided upon; and as late as March he was being hectored with interrogations, as a means of bringing pressure to bear upon him for the obtaining of exaggerated advantages. The Coalition thus spent the greater part of its time in negatively presenting its own candidate, in place of waging a well-planed campaign which would have brought him forward and set him over against the candidate of the opposition, thereby revealing to the public in bold relief his endowments as a capable, well-balanced, intelligent, and democratic statesman, all of which might have aroused among the broad masses of the Coalitionist parties a real enthusiasm for Dr. Saladrigas as President.

So much for the formation of the presidential slate. With regard to the senatorial, gubernatorial, and mayoralty candidates, the situation was not much better.

Four parties made up the Socialist-Democratic Coalition: the Liberal Party, the Democratic Party, the A.B.C., and the Popular Socialist Party. However, two of these parties alone, the Liberal Party and the Democratic Party, met together to decide on the distribution of candidates for the various senatorial, gubernatorial, and mayoralty posts. This naturally aroused doubt and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

led to indecision on the part of the A.B.C. and the Popular Socialist Party. The consequence was, our own party was given only two senators, and this despite the size of its membership and its political importance; and in addition, it had to spend all its energies in defending itself within the C.S.D., provoking a critical situation by the threat of withdrawal which it was compelled to make. As for the mayoralty posts, the distribution agreed upon was carried out in only a very few municipalities, all of which led to disturbances, sowed antagonisms, and resulted in hurt feelings which could not be overcome in the course of the electoral campaign properly speaking, which, complicated as it was, was an exceedingly brief one.

All this was reflected, could not but have been reflected, in the voting on the first of June.

II. Lack of Unity in the Coalition

The lack of unity within the Socialist-Democratic Coalition was undoubtedly another of the factors which led to its defeat. The fight that was begun between the Liberals and the Democrats for the presidential nomination was kept up throughout the whole of the campaign, being acutely reflected among the rank and file of the Coalition parties and among neutral citizens as well. Although the Coalitionist leaders had agreed upon a definite distribution of mayoralty candidacies, this agreement was carried out in almost none of the provinces. In the majority of the municipalities candidates for mayor were put up by the different Coalitionist parties, which then entered upon a sharp local contest, doing everything in their power to attract to themselves the rank-and-file vote of the Autentico Party, by promising at times to vote for the latter's presidential candidate, while at other times they limited themselves to speaking well of Dr. Grau and speaking ill of the government and of Dr. Saladrigas, by way of soothing the feelings of the Grau followers. The candidates for the Chamber and the Senate, who in the traditional parties have always depended for their election upon the mayors and district chieftains, not only tolerated this attitude on the part of the municipal candidates, but even, in the majority of cases, encouraged it, in order to assure themselves of a large preferential vote independently of the vote for President of the Republic.

All these divisions and internal struggles between the chieftains and leaders of the Socialist-Democratic Coalition, on a municipal as on a provincial and national scale, were strongly reflected among the masses, creating in the latter a lack of confidence with respect to the Coalitionist comrades and impelling them to a struggle among themselves in place of a united one against the adversary. Rarely was there to be found a municipality in which, there being two C.S.D. candidates for mayor, these two did not engage in mutual recriminations to the effect that one or the other had an understanding with the Grau forces to exchange municipal votes for presidential ones. Probably in the majority of cases these

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accusations were unfounded and no formal bargain had been struck between the mayoralty candidates; but in view of the nature of the campaign that was carried on and the rumors that flew from mouth to mouth, especially as election day drew near, this could not but have an influence upon the electorate, being responsible for any number of ballots that were cast for Grau, even while the voters chose their candidates for senator and representative from the columns of the Coalitionist parties.

Just as it was unable to overcome these dissensions of an electoral character, no more was the C.S.D. able to agree upon the conduct of a unified and coordinated campaign against its political opponents and in favor of its own executive candidates. The electoral interests of groups and individuals were imposed upon the general interest of the Coalition, the sole emblem of whose unity was the purpose of electing Saladrigas to the presidency of the Republic. The lack of unity in the C.S.D. was, therefore, reflected particularly in a diminished presidential vote, which gave the victory to Grau.

Owing to the political pressure of the Oppositionist Alliance, many Coalitionist leaders, bent upon winning the favor and support of the big magnates of industry and business, did everything possible to prevent the C.S.D. from coming forward with a program of popular demands or emphasizing such questions in the course of the campaign. On the other hand, the more progressive elements of the Coalition, realizing the true situation and the true significance of the political opposition — realizing, moreover, where the strength of the Alliance lay, namely, in the personal popularity of Dr. Grau—these sought, above all, to inject into the campaign a popular spirit and progressive demands, in correspondence with the desires of the masses, of the workers, peasants, white-collar workers, small business men, and the like.

III. The Lack of a Program

Confronted by the effective slogans of the opposition, the Socialist-Democratic Coalition lacked a clear and definite program capable of being understood and followed by the masses. In the preceding election campaign, under the concise slogan of Democracy, Social Justice and Defense of the National Economy, it was in a position to sum up a program of concrete demands, desired and hoped for by the masses, which gave a unity to its campaign and a preciseness of meaning to its promises. The basis of the C.S.D.'s campaign this time was its former program, which, however, was not presented as such to the masses, nor was it rendered sufficiently concrete or adjusted to present circumstances of the war situation. The principal slogans now were "Constitution, Administration, and Unity." These were launched very late in the campaign, without sufficient agitation and without being explained as fully as they should have been to the masses. What was lacking was a slogan that would have recog-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nized and synthesized the deepest aspirations of the masses at the present moment. This was one great weakness of the C.S.D., which, along with those other factors that we have mentioned, prevented it from winning the essential forces within the Cuban population, arousing their enthusiasm, and leading them to vote for its candidates.

By contrast, the opposition in this campaign had a number of definite, incisive, categorical slogans which, in spite of their negative character, succeeded in awakening the enthusiasm of a large part of the population. Exploiting the disaffections which every government arouses, however profoundly progressive it may be, our opponents raised the cry of "Anti-Continuationism," bringing to bear all the negative reasoning power which exists or ever has existed here in Cuba. In view of the traditional faults of the public administrations, the venality of functionaries, and the like, they came forward with the impressive slogan: Do away with public corruption; one that reflected the deep desires of the people, which the opposition knew how to exploit in clever fashion. In response to the irritation of the masses over the lack of meat and milk, the stock-jobbing and speculation in all products from automobile tires to kidney-beans, and holding the government responsible for the "black market," they raised another slogan that was equally effective: Do away with gambling and speculation. The effectiveness of such a slogan becomes apparent when it is remembered that the workers and white-collar workers were getting wages and salaries that were sufficiently high, while the price of farm products had gone up considerably. As a result, the workers, peasants, and urban employees found it extraordinarily difficult to procure meat, kerosene, and other commodities whose scarcity and high cost were increased by the black market operations.

Yet another slogan that was the subject of wide agitation by the opposition was one calling for a reduction in taxes. This was calculated to attract, and assuredly did attract, the sympathy not only of big business and the big land-owners, but of the legion of small businessmen and small landed proprietors as well.

In addition to all this, certain sectors of the opposition launched a furious anti-Communist campaign which had as its principal object not only that of attracting the sympathy of the Falangist and pro-fascist nucleus of large Spanish business concerns — deep-rootedly anti-Communist as all fascists are—but also that of giving assurance to all the big land-owners that, however revolutionary-sounding the popular agitation might seem, their interests would none the less be guaranteed by the persecution of Communists and the destruction of the trade unions.

In this manner it was that the Oppositionist Alliance succeeded in winning the active support of the most aggressive elements among the dominant classes, while at the same time it gained a mass base for its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

program and propaganda by arousing the enthusiasm of broad sections of the farmers, city employees, students, and workers, despite the radical opposition in feelings and interests to be found among these diverse strata of the population.

There is no doubt that the election results of the first of June were strongly influenced by the lack of a clear and definite program on the part of the Socialist-Democratic Coalition in confrontation with the effective slogans of the opposition. In combination with the other factors mentioned, this could not but be reflected in the activity of the masses in the course of the campaign and in the final returns.

IV. The Tolerance Shown Toward the Provocations of Certain Elements of the Opposition

In the course of the election campaign the government, respectful of popular liberties, sought to make this respect felt by the people even more strongly than usual. In the four years that it was in power President Batista's administration had allowed the broadest freedom of the press, of assembly, and of organization that had ever existed in Cuba, and this despite the contingencies of the war and those limitations which are normally to be expected in all countries, especially belligerent ones, in such a period. Certain groups inimical to the government and the Coalition proceeded to take advantage of these liberties in carrying out a whole series of provocations. Portraits of Saladrigas and posters for the Coalitionist candidate all over the island were torn down, burned and destroyed. This happened not only in connection with the repugnant spectacle in Central Park, Havana, where his picture was furiously torn to shreds and burned in the middle of the public square, but was a daily and systematic occurrence. Under cover of darkness specially constituted groups would go forth on these missions, and in no case did the authorities intervene to forestall such offenses against the freedom of propaganda of the Coalition. The consequence was, in spite of all the efforts put forth, campaign material for Saladrigas was hard to find, whereas the pictures and posters of Grau were to be seen everywhere and were, naturally, treated with respect by all the Coalitionists.

The business magnates and big landed proprietors of the Alliance carried out not a few provocations against the people with the toleration of the government, which feared being accused of acting out of partiality, from political motives; and so it was that elements like Federico Fernandez Casas and Delio Nunez Mesa in Oriente were enabled to make use of their economic power and their enormous wealth against the interest of the people, by persecuting farm workers, terrorizing the peasants, and making a mockery of social legislation, while all the time accusing the government of being the cause of these outrages. And the masses, thus mocked and persecuted and seeing themselves left unprotected by the authorities, logically blamed the government for it all, and accused

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the government's representatives of being in league with the elements mentioned, because of the tolerance shown toward such manifest illegalities.

In the same manner the big cattle-raisers of the opposition did everything in their power to see to it that, during the days immediately preceding the election, there should be no meat in Havana and the principal towns and villages of the island. By making use of every variety of argument, and by blackmailing the rationing boards to obtain for them increases and subsidies, they finally succeeded in eliminating the supply of meat from the Havana market and all the other important ones. The government, meanwhile, sought to temporize, and yielded to all these blackmailing tactics without being able to make up its mind to apply the one measure which would have assured a daily ration of meat for the population: namely, the taking over of the herds, which would thus have revealed to the people who it was that was responsible for the lack of this basic item of diet.

The big business houses likewise participated in this provocative conspiracy, by concealing their products, increasing the difficulties of supply, and asking illegal prices, even going so far as to hoard the small currency, thereby augmenting to the utmost the popular discontent.

In the face of such provocations as these, the government, pursuing its line of keeping up a show of impartiality with respect to the election, was in reality adopting an attitude that favored the anti-government provocateurs. The fact of the matter is, these provocations rendered it possible for the elements in question to make themselves masters of the situation during the days before the election, and they were thereby able strongly to impress public opinion, above all, the mass of electors who are not militant in politics, and who, influenced by their surroundings, are inclined to vote for that candidate who appears to have the greatest amount of popular support. It is clear that, had these provocations been halted in time; had Delio Nunez Mesa and Federico Fernandez Casas been compelled to obey the law and respect the Constitution and the rights of the people; had the big business houses been forced to abandon their provocative and conspiratorial attitude; and had the necessary cattle been taken over by the government for the provisioning of the masses—had all these things been done, then public opinion would have reacted in favor of the government and of the Coalition.

V. The Indecision of the Government with Respect to a Set of Basic Problems and the Cleverness of the Opposition in Exploiting That Indecision

Confronted with the problems created by these provocations and the obvious conspiracy on the part of certain big business magnates of the opposition, as well as with the natural difficulties imposed by the peoples' war against the Axis powers, the government vacillated with regard to adopting those drastic so-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lutions which were required of it, a vacillation of which the opposition most cleverly took advantage in the development of its election campaign. Previous to this period the government had acted with firmness and decision in such cases as those of the Bacardi rum distillery and the Tinguaro suger mill, when it took over these works upon the refusal of the companies to abide by the government decisions. These actions, despite the scandalous propaganda of the interested parties and the clear intent of the opposition to exploit the incident politically, had aroused a wave of sympathy for the government and for the C.S.D. Now, however, at the very beginning of the campaign, the government adopted an attitude of vacillation toward the questions of milk, meat, etc., questions which, being vital ones for the people, could only be solved by a very decisive course of action with respect to a dozen magnates.

The opposition for its part, as has been said, made capital of these vacillations in combating the Socialist-Democratic Coalition. While on the one hand its propagandists cried out to the heavens against government intervention, behind the false and threadbare argument of an "attack on the rights of property and economic stability," on the other hand the very same elements of the opposition were holding the government responsible for the lack of meat, bread, and other products, accusing it of not having acted with sufficient energy to solve these problems. In such a manner did the opposition, through the big land-owners, bring pressure to bear upon the administration to prevent its taking any decisive steps toward a solution, while at the same time utilizing the existence of the problems in question in combating the government, the C.S.D. and the Coalition's presidential candidate.

VI. The Irritation Produced Among the Masses by Those Hardships Created by the War and by Speculation

The war which the peoples of the world are waging for freedom and democracy against the powers of the Axis, a war in which Cuba is participating, brings with it, implicitly, enormous sacrifices and privations for the peoples of all countries, without exception; and Cuba, dependent for its supplies upon world markets, has encountered special difficulties in this regard, in the form of a scarcity of fuel, tires, machinery, building materials, foodstuffs, etc. This scarcity, as the result of a lack of strict and rigid control, has naturally led to a rise in prices, despite the measures taken and the regulations established by the O.R.P.A.* and, upon occasion, by the Council of Ministers. Although wage-scales, salaries, and the price of farm products have gone up considerably, this has not prevented the masses from suffering increasing hardships, since the rise in prices has in general exceeded that in salaries, wages, and pensions. Taking advantage of this situation, the jobbers and speculators have organized a black market, doing a

* *Oficina Reguladora de Precios y Abastecimientos* (Office for Regulating Prices and Supplies).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fabulous business and growing rich out of wartime privations.

Patriotically inspired by their hatred of the Axis, the masses have given evidence of being willing to put up with the sacrifices which the war entails, for the sake of freedom and democracy; but when, out of their sacrifices, their griefs, and their hardships, they have seen the stock-jobbers and the big business firms vastly and unscrupulously enriching themselves, as if the war meant very little to them, they have justly felt irritated. During the days preceding the election the lack of milk, meat and beans aroused the irritation of the masses to the highest pitch, and the masses were unreasonably set against the Socialist-Democratic Coalition and its presidential candidate; for a war consciousness and sentiment of national unity had not as yet been forged to a sufficient degree to assure their giving their preference to those who, above all other considerations, promised to take upon themselves the task of lending all possible aid to the United Nations war effort.

There can be no doubt that the irritation of the masses over wartime hardships was an important factor, along with others, in the defeat of the C.S.D.'s candidate for the presidency.

VII. The Bad Propaganda of the C.S.D.

All the weaknesses of the Socialist-Democratic Coalition were reflected in its campaign propaganda. In those districts (which were in a majority) where the C.S.D. was divided, the campaign in behalf of the candidates for mayor was an intensive one, but one and the other party commonly forgot to bring forward the Coalition's presidential nominee; and the same was true in connection with the campaign for senator and representative. What little coalitionist propaganda there was—really coalitionist in character—was lacking in aggressiveness; it was not dynamic, but cold and dead, incapable of arousing the enthusiasm of the rank and file or of the broad masses of voters in general. It followed strictly traditional lines: the candidate's portrait; a slogan; "Vote for So-and So."

The campaign carried on by the Alliance, on the other hand, was both an intensive and an aggressive one. Inasmuch as the presidential candidate was the axis of this coalition, all the candidates, with the object of capturing the Grau votes for themselves, strove to be seen at Dr. Grau's side as often as possible and did all they could to popularize his candidacy and assure his election. The radio was utilized to the fullest extent in spreading a propaganda marked by harsh aspersions against all the outstanding figures of the Coalition, particularly its presidential candidate, arguments being employed which at times were nothing short of indecent. Full use was also made of the system of group discussions and the whispering campaign. In the last days before the election the Alliance elements made themselves masters of the streets, with groups of young men who engaged in every variety of demonstration against the Coalitionist candidate and in favor of Dr.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Grau. With great cleverness they pounced upon all the deficiencies of the C.S.D., all the motives of internal division, and all the weaknesses of the government, all of which was designed to influence, and did in fact influence, the Coalitionist masses. When the leaders of the Coalition left the propaganda of the Alliance unanswered, they thereby destroyed the confidence of the rank and file and, by their own vacillating tactics, sowed doubts, the effect of which was to leave their followers unarmed in the presence of the enemy.

Such, briefly set forth, are the principal factors to be noted as having led to the defeat of the Socialist-Democratic Coalition's presidential ticket.

A study of the factors involved leads to the conclusion that the elections of last June do not by any means indicate an anti-democratic reaction on the part of the Cuban masses; nor are they to be interpreted as a protest against the collaboration of our country in the war upon the Axis criminals. Whatever may be the practical outcome of Dr. Grau San Martin's government, one thing is certain, and that is that the will of the nation on June 1 sought to express itself as being for freedom and democracy, for collaboration with the United Nations, and for a solution of the fearful problems created by wartime speculation.

A study of the causes of the defeat of the C.S.D. leads us to the conclusion that there was not the least anti-democratic reaction among the Cuban masses in the elections. Nor can the votes for Grau be considered a protest against Cuban collaboration in the war of liberation against the criminal Axis powers. Regardless of the aims of the Grau Government, the truth is that the people sought to express in the elections their will in favor of liberty, democracy and collaboration with the United Nations, in favor of the solution of the problems created by speculation and profiteering.

The votes cast for Grau on June 1 reflected the old hopes that thousands and thousands of Cubans have had in him ever since 1933, when he assumed office at a time in which the revolutionary movement had reached its highest level and he was, therefore, able to initiate a series of measures to transform Coba's economic and social life.

The support given to Grau by the reactionary elements and by the open Falangists did not and could not determine his victory. The fundamental base of his votes is to be found in the aspirations of the popular masses that the presidency of Dr. Grau would measure up to the promised administrative honesty and solve the most urgent and decisive problems.

This is the real political meaning of the election results of June 1.

The victory obtained by Dr. Grau has changed fundamentally the political conditions in which we were developing our struggle.

It will be necessary now to adapt our actions to the new conditions.

The struggle in favor of national unity, which has been the basic element of our policy ever since Cuba entered the war against the Axis

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powers, has now a special significance.

Under the new conditions our party will have to be ever more energetic, skillful and fearless in the struggle for national unity. Our adversaries and the enemies of the people will try to put forth a policy of provocations and conflicts so as to prevent the necessary unity among all the Cubans. We must learn to defeat these provocations and attacks with energy and vigor, and in such a way that we do not play into the hands of our enemies who want to open an abyss between us and the followers of Grau, to set us against the "Autenticos," and thus plant an explosive mine against national unity.

It is very important now that we insist tenaciously upon the principle that national unity, to be firm and enduring, must be based on the fulfillment and the enforcement by all of the Constitution of 1940.

We must give special emphasis in our propaganda to the basic objectives of national unity, *i.e.*, Cuba's collaboration with the United Nations to defeat the Axis and achieve victory, the necessary measures for our economic development, the industrialization of our country, agricultural diversification, measures against speculation and profiteering as activities carried on by the enemies of our country and of the war effort; measures to attain equal rights for all Cubans and the guarantee of the rights of the laboring masses as a just base for the full integration of all the national factors in the struggle to save our liberty and our fatherland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PLAN FOR POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT *

BY V. GAYEV

ONE of the acutest economic problems of the period between the First and Second World Wars was the problem of unemployment. In all countries, except the Soviet Union, there was a period of economic crisis. Beginning with the middle of the 1920's a majority of the countries also suffered from a severe agrarian crisis.

It is therefore only natural that wide sections of the public abroad are today anxiously wondering what the economic situation will be after this war and whether there will be a repetition of the profound crisis which followed on the heels of the First World War. Workers are wondering whether they will find employment. Farmers want to know whether they will be able to sell their produce at suitable prices. Governments are perturbed by the prospect of social consequences, of possible economic crisis and unemployment that are bound to accompany it.

It is easy to understand that in the period of demobilization, when countless workers will be returning from the armies, and the production of munitions will have ceased, the problem of finding employment for millions of persons will arise in all its acuteness in the countries abroad. The governments of the Anglo-American countries are already considering a number of measures in order to cope with this danger.

The first thing to be noted is that none of the plans for "full employment" of labor power, advanced abroad, envisages the complete abolition of unemployment. On the contrary, the preservation of a certain reserve army of labor is a characteristic feature of all these plans. The Beveridge Plan, for example, which the British government commissioned to be drawn up, estimates that unemployment among insured workers will in all probability amount to 8.5 per cent. In this figure Beveridge made due allowances for measures that may be taken to increase employment. It would be shortsighted to consider that the plan assumes that unemployment will not reach this level. For purposes of comparison, let us recall the period of 1930-1939, when unemployment among the insured workers of Great Britain averaged 13 per cent while unemployment among the working population of the United States exceeded 17 per cent.

* Reprinted from the Soviet journal *War and the Working Class*, No. 11.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is worth noting that the article on post-war unemployment problems printed in the April, 1943, issue of *Survey of Current Business*, published by the United States Department of Commerce, declared that if the level of production in 1946 does not surpass the level of 1940, the number of unemployed will reach 19,000,000.

The authors' plans for "full employment" do not, as we have said, strive for the complete abolition of unemployment. They only hope to prevent the catastrophe and increase of unemployment. What these plans amount to in effect is an attempt to eliminate the cyclical development of the production process or at least to restrict its cyclical fluctuations.

* * *

One of the most detailed programs for dealing with the problem of unemployment is the Nuffield College Memorandum.* It sets forth the opinions and recommendations of certain English economists and industrialists and makes an effort to reconcile the views of various different circles. The memorandum recommends a series of government measures designed to maintain and, if necessary, to increase the definite level of capital investments whereby it is hoped to ensure a sufficient demand for the means of production. For this purpose it is proposed, in addition to the usual budget, to introduce state budget capital investments.

This plan divides British industry into three groups, the first group comprising branches of industry of particular importance both because of their value to the economy of the country as a whole and because of the amount of capital invested in them; the second group, other branches of large-scale industry; and the third, small-scale industry.

The first group of industrial enterprises, according to the author's memorandum, should be nationalized. They chiefly include transportation services (railways, shipping ports, airlines, etc.), municipal services (water supply, gas works, power stations), and coal mines. Funds proposed in "state budget capital investments" are designed primarily for these branches of industry.

Enterprises in the second group are to be regulated by "industrial boards" that are to be set up in each branch of industry and heads of which are to be appointed and paid by the government.

Very much in the same line is the plan recommended by Lever Brothers and Unilever, big British soap firm. This plan, entitled "Problem of Unemployment," is not, like the Nuffield College Memorandum, a collective effort, but the product of one person. Its anonymous author, according to the British press, is a well-known economist. The underlying feature of the Lever memorandum is the belief that it is the function of the government to ensure an uninterrupted flow of capital investments. For this reason the Lever memorandum, like the Nuffield College Memorandum, recommends a

* *Employment Policy and Organization of Industry After the War: A Statement;* Nuffield College. Oxford University Press, London, 1943.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

double budget system (ordinary budget and budget capital investments). The author of the memorandum believes that a double budget will be an effective means of controlling the industrial cycle. The Lever memorandum does not consider it expedient to nationalize any branch of industry. At the same time, it is opposed in principle to government control of industry. According to this plan, the size of the capital investment budget should depend on the level at which the productive capacity is being utilized. As to the branches of industry in which state capital should be invested, that is a question to be decided in each particular case.

It is worth noting that neither of these plans has found support among the influential heavy industrial circle. Participating in the signing of the Nuffield College Memorandum are the following big manufacturers: P. S. Cadbury (chocolate), S. Courtauld (viscose), Lord Melchett (chemicals), Sir Cecil Weir (footwear). The Lever memorandum, as we said, is published by the British soap firm.

Recommendations advanced by heavy industrialists differ fundamentally from the above-mentioned plans. These recommendations are combined in a national plan for industry signed by 150 representatives of British big industry. This document also advocates the necessity for the regulation of production, in which the government is to have no hand. The government is to entrust all necessary measures to the industrial organizations under the guidance of a central industrial council. This national plan for industry holds that periodical industrial crises are inevitable and that unemployment during such economic crises cannot be restricted without government contracts. In addition to these memoranda, a number of other plans have been advanced to cope with the problem of post-war unemployment. Some of them hold that the fluctuation in the process of production can be prevented or at least diminished, not by capital investment, but by regulating public consumption.

Naturally, the problem of unemployment is one that particularly interests the Labor Party. In a plan for international postwar construction drawn up by the Executive Committee of that party for submission to its next conference which was convened for the end of May, but subsequently postponed indefinitely, the question of unemployment is dealt with in a section dealing with international economic organization. It should be stated that the proposals made were of a general character. While emphasizing the necessity for retaining rationing and many other forms of control in particular over raw material, prices, share issues, capital exports and foreign trade, the plan, on the other hand, deems it important to consolidate and extend international economic cooperation and in particular agreements for relief and rehabilitation for the organization of abundant supplies and food, and for the regulation of international trade, transport and currency relations.

Somewhat more definite were the recommendations of individual La-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bor Party members. For example, in a symposium entitled "Plan for Britain," published by the Fabian Society,* Jim Griffiths, Labor Member of Parliament, in remarking that the necessity for economic planning is admitted by all, goes on to say that the question is,

"Who shall plan? What kind of plan—and for what ends? . . . If we are to have a national plan at all, planned by the State for the whole of the nation, there are certain key controls which must be possessed by the nation. Unless they are in the hands of the nation, no national plan can possibly succeed."

Griffiths holds that the steel industry and railways should be nationalized. Another Labor member of Parliament, Aneurin Bevan, also favors nationalization of the main branches of industry. One article in the symposium is by Sir William Beveridge, who is considered one of the best experts on the unemployment problem in Great Britain. In his article he states:

"The private enterprise system at private risk, as we knew it between the two wars, did not give one any guarantee against mass unemployment. . . ."

Beveridge believes in the necessity for an economic plan designed to abolish widespread unemployment but remarks that to draw up such a plan and to carry it out are two different things. He holds that the government should have a part in planning but that the carrying out of such a plan should be mainly the function of private employers.

". . . it is very important to see," he writes, "if there is an alternative to complete Socialism as a means of finding employment after the war."

As we see it, Beveridge is by no means certain that the combination of "national planning" and the system of private enterprise will achieve the desired end. Nevertheless, he proposes that the experiment be tried.

* * *

In the United States, as in Great Britain, numerous plans are being proposed for post-war construction. In a handbook entitled *Post-war Planning in the United States: An Organizational Directory, 1943,* 137 organizations are enumerated which have drawn up plans for the post-war period, among them twenty-eight government bodies. There is also a central government organization, The National Resources Planning Board, whose function it is to collect, analyze, and collate plans for the post-war period, which declares that the paramount problem of economic planning in the post-war period will be "full employment" of labor power and prevention of prolonged depressions which usually succeed brief periods of boom. The American government appointed a special committee headed by the well-known financier Bernard M. Baruch which drew up

* *Plan for Britain,* A Collection of Essays prepared for the Fabian Society by G. D. H. Cole, Aneurin Bevan, M.P., Jim Griffiths, M.P., L. F. Easterbrook, Sir William Beveridge, and Harold J. Laski; London, George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1943.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a program for converting the national economy to a peacetime footing, in other words, a program of economic demobilization. This report, published in February, 1944, recommends governmental participation in economic activities in the post-war period, without the government, however, taking any part in the operations.

The American government, as we know, has since the outbreak of the war invested over $15,000,000,000 in war industry. Government plants which can be utilized in peacetime should be turned over at moderate prices to private persons, the Baruch report recommends. The underlying idea of this report coincides with the views of United States Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, who, in a speech made September, 1943, declared that the post-war active role of government in industry as such must cease at the earliest possible moment without incurring unnecessary losses.

A Senate Committee on Post-War Planning and the United States Chamber of Commerce expressed themselves in the same spirit. It is worth noting that, in connection with these preparations to put an end to the participation of the American government in industry, Congress of Industrial Organizations spokesmen have made known to the government the necessity of preparing to operate such plants, if manufacturers should decline to take over at a fair price.

Influential business circles in America, as well as circles close to the government, are opposed to capital investment by the government in the demobilization period. On the contrary, they demand the liquidation of all government enterprises immediately (and if possible) before the war ends. If this is their opinion with regard to the period of economic demobilization, they will insist all the more with regard to the period which follows demobilization.

Diverse projects for post-war economic construction are now being planned. They all agree that if wholesale unemployment is to be avoided broad governmental measures will be required. As to the scale and character of these measures, opinions sharply differ. But in this chaos, opinions of two underlying tendencies are to be observed.

The first advocates government measures to stimulate private initiative in periods of crisis and depression. This tendency predominates in the United States.

The second advocates current capital investments by the government (double budget) in order to counteract cyclical fluctuation in the process of production. This view is sponsored by certain influential circles in Britain, with the exception of representatives of heavy industry, whose proposals approximate those of the first tendency.

* * *

It is very important to note that all the plans advocating increased government contracts and government subsidies and capital investments bear marked indications of conflict of opinion over the question

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of distribution of the burden of taxation and state expenditures.

For which purposes are large government appropriations to secure maximum employment to be spent? The economic press indicates three possibilities: one, on unproductive expenditures (manufacture of armaments, for example); two, on capital investments for the promotion of "social welfare"—motor roads and other transport services, hospitals, organization of rational leisure, etc.; and, three, on subsidies for house construction and for slowly stimulating the production of consumer goods (automobiles, for example). The plan of 125 British industrialists proposes that for the purpose of finding "full employment" for labor power, the state should undertake a road-building and house-construction program, as well as a program for improvements in the water supply system. The Nuffield College Memorandum envisages state capital investments in transportation services as well as for the improvement of electricity, gas and water supplies. However, nowhere is the proposal made to expand the machinery of production through government investments. This reflects a characteristic feature of all these projects, namely, the fear of increased productive forces.

It is precisely that which constitutes the Achilles heel of all these projects, for they are unable to solve the fundamental problem, namely, the contradiction between the development of productive forces and the limitation of the market. They are unable to eliminate the basic evil and at best can only strive to postpone the moment when these contradictions lead to crisis.

There is another weak point in the proposals to restrict unemployment. All the big industrial countries are bound up with the world market. If a crisis breaks out in any big industry, in the United States, for example, it is bound to spread to other countries. Consequently, measures aiming at "full employment" of labor will be ineffective if they are confined to individual countries.

The English projects, while stressing the importance of foreign trade, actually focus their attention only on expanding their home market. Plans advanced in the United States, on the other hand, outline in definite measures the sphere of international trade. In August, 1943, the American Treasury Department published a detailed project which provides: one, for the formation of companies for the purchase of raw materials and foodstuffs surpluses which might depress the world market; two, for the control over world output of raw materials; and, three, for the creation of an international bank with a capital of ten billion dollars, for the rehabilitation and expansion of production in the post-war period. If we bear in mind that the problem of markets becomes very acute in the United States owing to the immense wartime expansion of the country's industry, it will be clear why all American projects for post-war construction devote so much attention to the potentialities of foreign markets.

In the Soviet Union every work-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

er is ensured the right to work, thanks to the nature of our economic system to which maladies, crises and unemployment are unknown. Thanks to this system, too, the Soviet peasant is never troubled by the problem of finding a market for his produce. So it was before the war and so it will be after the war. Nevertheless, although the horrors of unemployment are unknown to the Soviet people, we are following with interest the plans to combat this scourge in foreign countries.

At this moment, when the war of the democratic countries against Hitler Germany is at its height, it is difficult to say under what concrete conditions and to what degree the plans to diminish unemployment discussed in the foreign press will be adopted. However, an analysis of these projects enables us even now to draw certain conclusions.

* * *

The first conclusion is that the longer the war lasts and the greater destruction it causes to the foundations of economic life of the people, the harder, of course, will it be to provide work for the millions of people after the war. While selfish elements among the employer class may be interested in protracting the war only with the view of prolonging the golden rain of war superprofits, such is not the interest of the national economy as a whole and not of the working class and the broad laboring masses generally. Apart from the countless sacrifices, privations and sufferings of the peoples in the occupied countries, for the working masses of the Anglo-Saxon countries any unnecessary prolongation of the war will spell not only the loss of additional human lives but also worsened economic prospects for the post-war period. It is obvious, for example, that the diminution of national wealth resulting from the protracted war is bound to create additional handicaps to those broad government measures which are being proposed with a view to increasing the demand for labor power. It is likewise obvious that the destruction of producing machinery in the European countries where the Hitlerite bandits exercise sway and the further undermining of the very foundations of existing international division of labor, trade, credit and currency relations cannot but worsen the prospects for employment after the war. Hence, the working class and the laboring masses generally in all the democratic countries are vitally interested in the early defeat of the enemy from the standpoint of both their present and their future welfare.

The second conclusion to be drawn from the discussion of the various projects to combat unemployment in the foreign press is that the primary condition for any tangible success in this respect is to establish after the defeat of Hitler Germany a stable and lasting peace and international cooperation between the democratic countries. It is likewise clear that one condition for effective economic cooperation after the war is the creation of a firm political foundation for friendly relations among the peace-loving

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countries, both large and small.

It is also evident that in any serious evaluation after the war economic prospects cannot ignore the role which the Soviet Union is destined to play in this sphere, both as a producer and consumer of vast quantities of every kind of goods. It is repeatedly pointed out both in the Allied and neutral press that the Soviet Union, in order to repair the damage done to its national economy by the German fascist barbarians and in order further to develop and expand its powerful economic system, will require all sorts of goods from abroad, production of which would provide employment for large numbers of workers in the various countries. Consequently, the development of economic ties with the Soviet Union is rightly regarded by the democratic public abroad as one of the most effective means of ameliorating the problem of unemployment.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNITED NATIONS MONETARY POLICY

BY STEVE NORTH

[*A general article dealing with the recommendations made by the United Nations Monetary Conference will appear in* The Communist *following the conclusion of the Conference still in session at Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, as we go to press. The article below sets forth the opinions of a Canadian author who discusses certain salient aspects of the international monetary problem. It is reprinted from* National Affairs Monthly, *July, 1944, published by the Labor-Progressive Party, Toronto, Canada. —The Editors.*]

THE first international organization to arise out of the wartime collaboration of the United Nations is UNRRA—the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Its function is to administer relief to liberated areas as soon as possible after the end of hostilities. The second international organization, which has not yet been set up but for which plans have been laid, is the International Monetary Fund. This is designed to aid in the expansion of world trade after the war by removing some financial restrictions.

It is true that no financial mechanism will enable one country to buy more than it sells abroad for long. Expressed in financial terms, each country's international transactions have to balance, whether this is done by equalizing expenditures and receipts, by shipping gold, or by borrowing abroad. If the balance is attained by borrowing, receipts for exports and other services must still be gradually brought into line with payments for imports, services and other expenses or the loans will dry up. In the past, all too frequently the balance has had to be reached quickly and the only way to do this was to cut down imports and other expenditures abroad. This meant closing the market for the supplying countries' goods and services with resulting unemployment for them, which in turn rapidly spread to still others. A central purpose of the International Monetary Fund is to provide some reasonable adjustment period for this process to take place; to avoid pushing any country into drastic moves by extension of credit from a joint pool of resources. This will be especially needed after the war when a rapid expansion of world trade is desirable from many points of view.

Before discussing the need for international cooperation in financing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foreign trade, let us first review briefly the lessons of past experience. Trading within any country is easily carried on because all of the traders are willing to accept the same currency. Prairie wheat is sold in eastern Canada for the same kind of money as Ontario automobile manufacturers get for their product in the Maritimes or British Columbia. But the situation is different when the trading is between different countries using different kinds of money. Exports of Canadian wheat to Switzerland for Swiss francs are useful if we wish to import an equivalent value of Swiss watches or other Swiss products, but otherwise only if the Swiss francs can be exchanged somewhere for other currencies which we need to buy imports elsewhere. Although prior to World War I the British pound sterling was used over a fairly wide area as a common international currency, and since then to some extent the same has been true of the U.S. dollar, the ultimate common denominator for a good many years has been gold.

The difficulty with using gold as a standard of value in international trade at the same time that it formed the basis for various nations' internal currencies was that the resulting "system" proved much too rigid in operation. Conditions which affected the external value of a country's money (*e.g.*, increasing excess of imports over exports) had automatic repercussions in the internal economy of the country (*e.g.*, an outflow of gold reducing the money base, thereby starting a restrictive credit policy which produced falling prices and unemployment).

The need for an international approach to the problems of orderly financing of world trade became clearly evident during the chaotic period of the 1930's. Even as far back as 1919, there were attempts at international cooperation to avoid extreme exchange fluctuations which were very disrupting to international trade. The United States, for example, suggested conventions with the other American Republics to establish a gold-clearance fund, but none of these was ever ratified. The avowed purpose was "to stabilize exchange and facilitate the settlement of balances" and it was further intended that the various countries would consider adoption of "a uniform exchange standard." (Draft Convention for the Establishment of an International Gold-Clearance Fund, *Foreign Relations of the United States,* 1919, Vol. 1, pp. 43-44.)

In the world economic crisis which began in 1929 one country after another refused to be bound longer by the limitations of this gold standard system. Yet the managed exchange alternative adopted in most cases had other serious faults of its own. Violent exchange fluctuations disrupted international trade, and competitive export price-cutting through drastic exchange depreciation often had very damaging effects. It became plainly evident that a policy of everyone for himself would not work, although there was little progress toward an improved system up to the outbreak of the present war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What is needed is enough cooperation in handling financial transactions between countries so that one country is not free to adopt any policy no matter how damaging to the others, yet is not subjected to the rigid restrictions of the old gold standard. The fundamental dilemma can be stated in terms of internal and external price levels. The old gold standard maintained a stable external price level (by reason of the export of gold whenever necessary to balance payments and receipts) at the expense of internal price stability. On the other hand, the attempts during the 1930's to maintain internal price stability by managed money policies often resulted in wide exchange fluctuations, which greatly hampered foreign trade and sometimes inflicted heavy burdens on other countries (*e.g.*, by raising the price of imports that they dried up, thus cutting off the market for the exporting country). The obvious answer to this dilemma is that there must be some compromise. Under certain conditions a country will need to maintain a relatively stable internal price level despite the results externally, while under other conditions some degree of price change internally may not be too costly a method of maintaining exchange stability to foster a high level of international trade.

It is such a compromise that is embodied in the Joint Statement on the Establishment of an International Monetary Fund, released on April 21 simultaneously in Ottawa, Washington, London and Moscow. Professor Alvin Hansen of Harvard, in *PM* of May 8, used the apt analogy that international trade was like a swimming party. Under the old gold standard practice, some members of the party always drowned. Some of the more utopian plans for financing world trade were like trying to swim without getting wet. The new International Monetary Fund has the faults of neither extreme—it in effect removes the danger of drowning without taking the absurd position that there is no need to get wet at all. His conclusion is sound. The International Monetary Fund is not perfection, but is much better than either the old gold standard or the anarchistic managed exchange systems of the 1930's.

The objectives of the International Monetary Fund, as given in the Joint Statement, may be summarized as follows:

1. To provide a permanent institution for consultation on international monetary problems;

2. To facilitate the expansion of international trade toward the primary objective of maintaining a high level of employment and real income;

3. To give countries time to correct unbalance in their international financial transactions without resorting to measures destructive of national or international prosperity;

4. To promote exchange stability;

5. To furnish a common denominator and common interchange for individual countries' moneys for all ordinary transactions;

6. To eliminate restrictions which hamper the growth of world trade.

Few could quarrel with these ob-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jectives. Although they are stated to be those of the experts only and no government is yet firmly committed to them, they obviously could not have reached the present stage without the tacit backing of important nations. Like every other aspect of international relations, the perspective for a cooperative monetary plan has been completely changed since the Teheran Accord. A key factor in any large-scale expansion of world trade must be an improved system of making foreign payments. Agreement of the decisive world powers on the outlines of such an improved system cannot be merely a technical matter of no great importance. The fact that there is such agreement following Teheran, when there was so much disagreement before (Keynes plan versus White plan, etc.), must be a reflection of more basic understandings on post-war policy affecting such matters as trade, rehabilitation of devastated areas, and industrialization of undeveloped regions. U.N.R.R.A. was an expression of United Nations cooperation for emergency measures immediately following cessation of hostilities. Monetary and trade plans are an expression of such cooperation carrying over much further into the post-war period.

Although discussions of international currency plans had been going on for months, as far as we know the Russians took no part in them until after Teheran. They then sent an important delegation of experts to the United States, and after several weeks' discussions with U.S. Treasury officials, they reached agreement on the general principles. Before Teheran there were at least three currency plans given wide publicity—the British or Keynes plan, the American or White plan and the Canadian plan. While these differed somewhat, they were similar in that they were not very realistic and contained potentially harsh provisions for the smaller debtor countries. Now there is the Joint Statement embodying the principles of the International Monetary Fund. This removes the negative features of the earlier plans and embodies a realistic compromise between the alternatives of a stable internal price level and stable external prices (exchange rates).

It is important to consider the threefold significance of Russian participation in this international proposal after Teheran. First, it is obvious that, by the existence of the anti-Hitler Coalition, with the U.S.S.R. as a component, the smaller nations can rest secure in the knowledge that, in the management of such a fund, they have a staunch defender against any moves which might sacrifice their interests to those of any predatory groups in the big nations. Secondly, as indicated above, Russian participation in the discussions has preceded publication of a much improved plan. Thirdly, continued development of the world situation which produced the Teheran Agreement must contain possibilities for self-determination in colonial and semi-colonial areas and the chance for more democratic regimes in many European countries. These possibilities in themselves present

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obstacles to the growth of political domination following automatically on the export of capital.

In the past, an export of capital from an imperialist power to a backward or under-developed country usually took the form of a money loan which was tied to the purchase of goods and services from the lending country. Almost as a matter of course such loans were accompanied by other important economic concessions granted to the lender by the ruling clique in the borrowing country. The latter in turn was usually bought off by direct bribes (*e.g.*, exorbitant commissions on some Latin American bond issues sold in the U.S.A.) or indirectly by participating in the exploitation of their own country by foreign capitalists (*e.g.*, the "mingling" of American and Canadian capital and management in the operation of U.S. subsidiary plants in Canada). With truly democratic governments at the receiving end of capital exports, however, the situation is radically changed. The economic and political concessions will not be given in return for the capital and the direct and indirect bribery will be absent. The capital export will likely be made in the form of goods, that is, the time sequence of the former practice will be reversed. Under prospective post-war conditions it is clearly to the advantage of the exporting country to make the capital export in this manner in order to maintain employment at home. It is also to the advantage of the capital importing country to get the goods in this manner without having to pay for them at once. In fact, some additional credit mechanism will be necessary to bridge the gap between lease-lend and mutual aid exports during the war to countries which cannot pay for them, and the time when commercial exports can be handled in sufficient volume to maintain full employment.

Canada's interest in foreign trade is great, so that any means of maintaining or expanding this source of employment at home must be carefully considered. The Deputy Minister of Finance, in his evidence before the House Committee on Reconstruction and Re-establishment on March 8, 1944, stated that Canada's foreign trade in 1943 approached a value of $5,000,000,000. This is about double the value in 1928 and 1929. Exports, largely consisting of munitions, foodstuffs, metals and forest products, are now running at an annual rate of $3.000,-000,000—at least twice the volume of 1913 exports.

Concretely, how would the proposed International Monetary Fund work for Canada? To begin with, Canada will have to contribute our share of the eight to ten billions making up the Fund. This contribution might be about $300,000,000, of which at most one-quarter would be in gold and the remainder in our own dollars. (*Monthly Review* of the National City Bank of New York, May, 1944.) Since we dig the gold out of the ground in Canada and since we can issue our own dollars from the Bank of Canada, this contribution will not constitute any serious burden on the economy. The value of the Canadian dollar will be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

established in relation to the value of all other members' currencies by expressing it in gold equivalent. We will likely continue to import more from the United States than we export to that country, so we will need to draw on the fund for the excess U.S. dollars to pay for our imports. We would do this by selling either Canadian dollars or some other currency such as sterling which the fund will buy for U.S. dollars. To the extent that we are able to finance our import balance in this way we shall avoid the necessity of having to borrow money in the United States, say by selling our securities there. Similarly, the British West Indies will probably wish to import considerably more from Canada than we buy from them. They will be able to do this by drawing on the fund for the excess Canadian dollars they need, instead of having to go into debt to us or get the British to supply the funds for them. Otherwise, they would have to cut down on their imports from Canada, thus decreasing employment in our industries catering to these export markets. Lastly, should it be felt in Canada that the initial par value of our currency was established at too high a level, or that conditions had changed somewhat since the initial rates were determined, it would be possible for us to change the value by 10 per cent without the fund having the right to deny this to us. If further change were necessary, we should have to make our case to the fund and get a simple majority vote in favor of doing so. It is specifically set forth in the principles of the Joint Statement that "in particular, the fund shall not reject a requested change necessary to restore equilibrium, because of domestic, social or political policies of the country applying for a change." This means, therefore, that the fund cannot be used as a means of embarrassing a country which is carrying out a progressive anti-depression policy at home, or is turning to socialism in the organization of its production, by denying it the right to change the gold equivalent of its currency, *i.e.*, varying the exchange rate.

This is the essence of the compromise between stable exchange and stable internal prices. Some change can be made in the exchange rate as a matter of right, and further change is allowable when a good case has been made for it. But the plan precludes the possibility of one country making such arbitrary changes in its exchange rate that it seriously damages the economic life of other countries. This provision for greater flexibility in adjusting exchange rates removes one of the most serious drawbacks in the earlier plans. They stuck too closely to the effective working of the gold standard, leaving it within the power of the fund to force a deflationary policy on a debtor country in lieu of some exchange depreciation.

The reduction in the exchange value of one currency in terms of gold and other currencies, or exchange depreciation, has both uses and abuses, as do many other economic techniques. Britain unquestionably softened the effect of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world crisis at home in 1931 by depreciating sterling, for this lowered export prices with resulting stimulus to the export industries. At the same time the offsetting rise normally to be expected in import costs was more than overcome by the greater drop in prices of foodstuffs and raw materials which resulted from the world crisis in agricultural and colonial countries. Australia also benefitted from exchange depreciation in 1931. No doubt Canada could have done so too. But this does not minimize the fact that in some instances exchange depreciation was carried to lengths during the 1930's that were quite harmful to international trade as a whole—for example by Germany.

A further practical improvement contained in the new plan is that it avoids loading the fund with all kinds of transactions, including relief, in the period immediately after the end of the war. The fund is designed primarily to assist in the financing of trade as conditions settle down. It does not attempt to impose unrealistic provisions, such as complete abolition of exchange controls, in the transition period from war to peace.

It has been frequently emphasized that no currency plan can be a cure-all for the economic ills of a capitalist world. Yet, as this article attempts to show, a good plan has real value. The proposed International Monetary Fund is one more piece of the network of international cooperative machinery that is emerging out of wartime collaboration of the United Nations. This is certainly different from the loose, semi-utopian kind of organization which grew out of the last war, where the League of Nations at times was used by various strong powers for their own ends and at other times was completely impotent and discredited.

As for Canada, the greatest need at the present time is continually to press the government to adopt itself and put forward for the consideration of others a realistic stand on all questions of international collaboration. As has been pointed out by the Labor-Progressive members in the House of Commons, discussion of these plans should take place in Parliament, however, not behind the scenes by the "experts." The tendency so far is to pay lip service to the idea of international cooperation and then to come out with no plan at all, or else one which is too utopian for possible acquiescence on the part of other powers (for example, the Canadian currency plan or the Canadian draft air convention). The real need is for our government to give hard-headed support to realistic plans that have some hope of achievement. This is the Russian way, as evidenced in their backing of U.N.R.R.A., their agreement with the principles of the International Monetary Fund, their willingness now to place colossal orders for equipment and supplies to be delivered after the war, and their suggestion for using the German army as a labor battalion to rebuild devastated Europe.

The Canadian government has been in the forefront in discussion of international currency plans. But so far the only explanation that has

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been given to the public has been some talks to bankers and businessmen by a few Ottawa officials. If the government is serious in its support of the International Monetary Fund, then it is high time that an attempt is made to explain to the farmers and workers what it is all about. A strong public opinion in favor of such a plan in Canada will help immensely to generate the same kind of support from the workers and farmers of the United States. There such support is badly needed, for the isolationists are attacking the plan for their own political reasons, and the Wall Street bankers are trying to obstruct it because they fear losing their stranglehold on the stream of international finance which they have kept shrouded in mystery for so long.

In giving our full support to the International Monetary Fund, however, we must not lose sight of two facts. The fund itself is only one piece of international cooperation that must embrace other related fields, such as relief, credit, tariffs and trade restrictions, raw material price floors, etc., to be effective. Each one of these plans must be appraised concretely. Similarly, we must not overlook the fact that a great deal can be done at home in Canada to promote employment after the war no matter what happens abroad. Certainly international trade is very important, but even greatly expanded foreign trade cannot do the whole job of maintaining employment and incomes at high levels in Canada if other things are left undone. There is some danger of slurring over the jobs to be done at home by giving too concentrated attention to the problems of international trade and finance. We need both international cooperation and a high degree of internal unity to provide the people of Canada with jobs after the war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"TALKING SPOKANE" IS "TALKING TEHERAN"

A Review of Eric Johnston's *America Unlimited* *

BY ROBERT DIGBY

IN *America Unlimited*, Eric Johnston, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has written a new credo for American capitalism. In this book Mr. Johnston discloses not only a deep understanding of American life but also a realistic evaluation of the great forces now shaping the course of world history.

"A magnificent opportunity," the author points out, is now open to us. We can either go forward on the road that leads to an enduring peace and economic prosperity or we can pass up the opportunity to achieve "America Unlimited" and allow ourselves to sink down in a morass of international anarchy, domestic discord, imperialist rivalry, and an economy of scarcity.

Mr. Johnston believes that "the diverse elements in our national life can work together, as partners in a joint effort." Such unity is essential, if we are "to prosper together as complementary parts of a prosperous community." But there is nothing "automatic" in this process, and "to a greater measure than most of us realize, the choice rests with each one of us."

In addition to national unity, there must also be close international cooperation, if we are to maintain the peace and achieve economic security. As Mr. Johnston says, we must "make manifest to ourselves and to others America's readiness to pull its share of the weight in economic affairs."

Mr. Johnston has confidence in American capitalism. He is justly proud of the great wartime production record that our nation has achieved. He does not shrink from the prospect of industrializing Latin America or putting war-devastated countries back on their feet. In fact, he regards any postwar policy of contracting our expanded economy to prewar levels as "the one thing, more than any other, which might doom capitalism." "The maximum economic welfare of all nations is," he asserts, "the best possible peace insurance . . . the fundamental condition of a stable society." Such a conception does not mean, as some people would have us believe, that

* *America Unlimited*, by Eric Johnston, Doubleday, Doran and Co., New York, 1944, 254 pp., $1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we would become "the Santa Claus nation" of the world; on the contrary, it offers the only practical, realistic perspective for the advancement of our own national interest.

"Prosperity, like peace, is indivisible," declared Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau in his opening address before the United Nations Monetary Conference. And Mr. Johnston also recognizes that there can be no lasting peace unless all nations are allowed a full share in this postwar prosperity which is open to us. In urging America to continue a policy of international cooperation after the war, he says:

"But we must get over the puerile notion that in doing so we are somehow being noble and high-minded. American participation in a world organization to prevent war . . . will not be a philanthropic 'internationalist' policy. It will be an American policy designed to save our own skins. . . .

"The temptation to withdraw from the world and let it 'stew in its own juice' is a powerful one. We yielded to it once before. If we resist it now, as I am convinced we shall, it will be because we cannot afford to do otherwise. We cannot afford the disorders, anarchy, and desperations which would ensue."

The best summary of Mr. Johnston's thinking on international relations is given in his four-point program for the postwar period:

"1. Frank acceptance of obligations in maintaining world peace, through some type of multilateral organization and including, if necessary, cooperative policing of danger zones.

"2. Effective military preparedness as insurance against the possible failure of such world organization and as a deterrent to would-be aggressors.

"3. Tolerance for the political and economic systems of other nations, and non-intervention in their internal affairs.

"4. The maximum encouragement of world trade consistent with American interests."

"Rightly or wrongly, I can assure myself that in speaking for Eric Johnston," the author tells us, "I am speaking for a great legion of Eric Johnstons. What makes my essential ideas and hopes significant, I can tell myself, is not their quality of uniqueness but the fact that they are fairly typical, and certainly widespread." As president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Johnston speaks for a considerable segment of American business. In the U.S. Chamber of Commerce there are 500 national trade associations, 1,300 local chambers of commerce, and 13,000 firms holding major memberships, along with 737,000 firms holding minor memberships or being otherwise represented in the organization. If Mr. Johnston's views did not find support among American businessmen, it is not likely that he would have been reelected president for his third successive year.

In reading *America Unlimited* one must bear in mind that it is made up largely of excerpts from articles and speeches dating back to the early part of 1942. Fast-moving events have often moved far beyond the immediate problems of the earlier period, and lifting these ex-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cerpts out of their original setting has necessarily left some of them suspended in mid-air. Although, in this sense, the book does Mr. Johnston something of an injustice, it is a tribute to his vision that the general principles upon which he based himself continue to hold good.

As Mr. Johnston himself puts it, ". . . this book grew . . . above the surface" and even more "below the surface." The growth above the surface is visible, and indeed quite interesting when one goes back and reads his earlier writings; but the growth below the surface will be revealed only as Mr. Johnston declares himself on the immediate, concrete issues of the day.

Neither labor nor other groups on the side of abundance are likely to take issue with Mr. Johnston's broad perspectives for an "America Unlimited." His formulations of general principles are generally excellent and thoroughly in keeping with "the historical three-power conference in Teheran." It is only with his failure to implement concretely so many of his statements of general principles and with some of the implementation itself that we would disagree.

On Domestic Issues

On domestic issues, such as reconversion, we look in vain for any mention of the Kilgore Bill or any endorsement of its specific provisions necessary to safeguard the interests of the people generally during the reconversion process. Mr. Johnston tells us that he has always been in favor of social security; but he offers no concrete recommendations for strengthening the social security program and makes no reference to the Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill. He takes his stand on the side of price stabilization; but he does not speak out on the specific points at issue, such as subsidies, or place responsibility at the door of the inflationist group in Congress which has consistently sought to wreck the price control program. As for the war waged by the disrupters in Congress against the Chief Executive, Mr. Johnston does not raise his voice against the trouble-makers. Unfortunately, his criticisms are, for the most part, directed against the President, even though his thrusts are occasionally tempered by admissions that "Mr. Roosevelt is . . . a highly capable citizen called to leadership in our nation's most trying hour in this century."

Mr. Johnston's oft-repeated tirades against "government - in - business" serve to weaken his own thesis and to play into the hands of those seeking to make an issue of "free enterprise." He asserts that "Earl Browder officially postponed 'the revolution' . . . and advised his embattled legions to 'lay that pistol down.'" While we might prefer that Mr. Johnston spare humor in the interest of accuracy, we should like to call his attention to something more important. In refusing to allow "free enterprise" to become an issue of contention, the Communists took the wind out of the sails of the reactionary forces who hoped to weaken national unity by embarking upon a diversionist expedition for the "rescue" of "free enterprise."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Johnston himself admits that such a course would "doom capitalism," and yet his own frequent outbursts against "bureaucracy" provide fuel for the demagoguery of these selfsame reactionaries who would wreck the Teheran basis upon which Mr. Johnston stands.

No doubt, much of Mr. Johnston's inveighing against the Government, as well as some of his other departures from his general principles, stem from nothing more than the desire of a shrewd businessman to drive a hard bargain. At one point, for example, he follows his criticism of government-in-business by urging that the government revise tax laws in such a manner as to provide an additional reward for "risk-taking" and assure business a larger incentive in reconverting to peacetime, civilian production. On other occasions, however, Mr. Johnston himself warns against any "laissez-faire attitude which would cut off its nose to spite its face." In Moscow he made the proposal that the U.S. government should underwrite the loans and credits necessary to ensure a large volume of postwar trade. As a leading spokesman of American business, Mr. Johnston could strengthen the case for "free enterprise" by avoiding the partisan practice which labels all government intervention as "bureaucracy."

At no time does Mr. Johnston cross swords with the Hearsts, Pattersons, or McCormicks. Yet he must realize that they oppose the very things for which he stands. His failure to challenge these pro-fascists or the bloc of defeatists and obstructionists in Congress, coupled with his criticisms of the Administration and epithets against "bureaucracy," shows that he has not drawn the full conclusions from his own statement of position. The elections in November will be a crucial test of whether or not we are to continue the march toward "America Unlimited." As a Republican and a spokesman for business, Mr. Johnston could do much to aid the cause he espouses by putting aside his partisanship and exerting his leadership in industrial circles to mobilize full support to the forces for national unity in the elections behind the Commander-in-Chief.

"Mission to Britain"

At the time of his visit to England in August, 1943, Eric Johnston found British businessmen "anxious" to reach an understanding with American businessmen, more anxious than our businessmen were to reach an understanding with British capital. Mr. Johnston told British businessmen that "there are no insurmountable obstacles to British-American cooperation." He even spoke of "a marriage of American capital and British assets wherever possible after the war."

He offered no solution, however, to the all-important question of how this cooperation was to be achieved and leveled the implicit threat that, after the war, American businessmen intend to engage in all-out competition with the British. Mr. Johnston was no doubt playing his cards close to his chest. He twitted the British for clinging to their Empire Policy; but the only alternative that he left open to them was, as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Earl Browder pointed out, the prospect of American monopoly domination.

"The British national government is truly and completely sovereign," Mr. Johnston told the British.

"It can do anything. Ours cannot. It has only such powers as the people have given it." He avowed that the American "regards all powers, in government or in business, as subject to constant revision—by himself. Now what this American is in America, he will also be in international affairs." Regardless of what his intentions might have been, Mr. Johnston's words, as Earl Browder pointed out, could then mean for the British only one thing, namely, that there was no immediate prospect for working out stable, orderly agreements with American capital for the postwar period.

Mr. Johnston dismissed British proposals for cooperation as "cartel" agreements. It is true, as Mr. Johnston claimed, that the American people are opposed to cartels, and we would certainly have liked him to speak out against some of the nefarious cartel agreements such as those negotiated by du Pont and Standard Oil with I. G. Farben, the economic arm of the Nazi state. Here were American interests entering into what were in effect private, secret treaties with the Nazi Government, made without consulting our Government and even providing for the continuation of such agreements in the event of war between the U.S. and Nazi Germany. Certain fascist-minded industrialists in the U.S. have openly flouted their own Government, serenely setting themselves above the state, while trying to conceal their treachery by sanctimoniously decrying "too much interference in business."

Of America and England, Mr. Johnston said, "They will 'sink or swim' together." Although he intended that they swim together, his proposals sounded to the British like an open invitation to sink, with Mr. Johnston politely urging, "After you, my dear Alphonse."

Johnston in the Soviet Union

Mr. Johnston's recent mission to Moscow was far more successful than his "Mission to Britain," as he titles one chapter of his book. One reason for this, perhaps, was that he did not go to the Soviet Union looking for any return to laissez-faire competition, as was seemingly the case in Britain. Before he went to the Soviet Union, Johnston referred to "Russia and the United States" as representing "two extremes" and added:

"In any case, there is no necessity for friendly nations to have identical economic structures. We can—and we must—learn to adjust differences in external relations, while following our own way internally. In the co-existence of contrasting systems, conflict is by no means inevitable. . . ."

When he first spoke in Moscow, it is true, Mr. Johnston resorted to phrases such as "you Soviet capitalists," but this double-talk as well as his Red-baiting of American Communists was obviously intended for home consumption. It was at the very places in his speech where he

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paid the highest tribute to the unparalleled industrial growth of the socialist nation that Mr. Johnston thought it expedient to address his Soviet listeners as "great capitalists." In this speech, however, he made it plain that he, as well as other American businessmen, do not subscribe to the Hoover school of thought whose hatred for the Soviet Union has long been of the incurable variety. He frankly admits that he too was formerly prejudiced but now recognizes the need for continuous, friendly cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union after the war.

It is not because capitalists are becoming socialists or socialists capitalists, that Eric Johnston flew to Moscow. It is because the only hope for world security and economic stability is that the great socialist nation and the outstanding capitalist nation continue to cooperate after the war, with each other and with other nations, for the mutual interest of all concerned.

Mr. Johnston himself clearly outlined the first principles for a genuine Soviet-American understanding on postwar trade when he recommended in his Moscow speech:

"One, let us resign ourselves to the fact that, certainly for a long time to come, you and we are going to live in two different economic ways. Two, let us visit and trade. Let there be more Soviet businessmen who know the Mississippi Valley. Let there be more American businessmen who know the valley of the Volga."

After his return from the Soviet Union, it became apparent that Eric Johnston had achieved a new and deeper understanding of our Soviet Ally. His discussions with Marshal Stalin and other Soviet officials, as well as his experiences with the Red Army and visits to Soviet factories, made a profound impression upon him, Mr. Johnston tells us. At his one-hour press conference in Washington, D. C. on July 13, Mr. Johnston spoke with warmth and feeling about the spirit of the Red Army and the Soviet people. He praised their high degree of unity and their heroic efforts in fighting the war against the common fascist enemy. He gave as his opinion that Soviet trade unions are strong, voluntary organizations whose purpose is to better the condition of their members; thus Mr. Johnston, speaking as a capitalist, does not hesitate to admit the truth about Soviet trade unions which has long been recognized by sincere labor leaders but is still denied by Messrs. Green, Hutcheson, Dubinsky, and Watt.

Mr. Johnston spoke in detail about the large-scale plans which the Soviet Union is already preparing to rebuild its industries, including Stalin's discussion with him of a program for more than doubling its railroad system. He pointed out that Soviet reconstruction plans offer a tremendous market for U.S. mining equipment, road-building machinery, hydro - electric facilities, rolling stock, ships, trucks, and all sorts of machinery for the manufacture of consumer goods. He told the press:

"I believe that it is Marshal Stalin's complete desire to rebuild Russia and not to engage further in world conflict if he can avoid it.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia is operating under a completely different economic system than we are. She is the most collectivized state the world has ever seen. But I see no reason why we cannot cooperate in spite of that.

"I think that we have no conflicts of interest, other than that, perhaps. Neither one of us, I'm sure, wishes territorial aggrandizement from the other. I think a prosperous United States and a prosperous Soviet Union will go far toward preserving the peace of the world after the war."

With these bold words, Mr. Johnston has more than offset whatever slight misunderstanding some of his earlier statements in Moscow may have caused. He minces no words in declaring that Soviet Russia can be counted upon to cooperate with the United States in maintaining peace and promoting trade after the war. As a representative of American business, Mr. Johnston has taken the leadership in calling upon his fellow capitalists to put aside past prejudices and be prepared to make long-term credits to the Soviet Union. He assures them that "the credit of the Soviet Union is as good as any credits in the international field." Not only are the Soviet resources vast, he asserts, but it can make payments by sending us copper, manganese, tungsten, platinum, cobalt, nickel, furs, and many other products.

Mr. Johnston's statement is the most important declaration on U.S.-Soviet economic relations by a representative of American business that has been made since the outbreak of the war. It is a milestone in the history of our two countries and will do much to dispel the old fears that still lurk in some quarters. While the Deweys and Hoovers still try to avoid all direct references to the Soviet Union by name, taking snide digs at our Soviet Ally whenever possible but gagging on any explicit mention of it when tribute must be paid to our fighting allies, the President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has no such trepidations. As a realist, he recognizes that friendly economic relations between the two nations are necessary for the well-being of the United States and of the world generally. His visit to the Soviet Union has confirmed the wisdom of his own advice that more American businessmen should visit the valley of the Volga.

Committee on International Economic Policy

Since Mr. Johnston's book has been published, the announcement has been made that American business and banking groups have formed a Committee on International Economic Policy, of which Eric Johnston is a member. As chairman of the new committee, Winthrop W. Aldrich of the Chase National Bank publicly announced its formation on July 5, indicating that one of its first proposals would be the creation of a United Nations' Economic Organization. The purpose of this move is to unify American capital so that its representatives may consult with those of other national interests and agree upon common economic policies.

This is an important development. It has already received the support

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the American Bankers Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, and other groups. It is indeed a necessary step, if the United States is to avoid becoming an isolated "island of free enterprise," whereon each business grouping reserves for itself the sovereign right to act in its own self-interest and to veto any economic policies agreed upon by its own Government in conference with other nations. The success of the new committee and its proposed United Nations' Economic Organization will depend upon whether or not American businessmen can rise above short-sighted considerations and agree upon a long-term policy of international cooperation in conformity with the principles enunciated at Teheran. If American capital uses its new unity simply to enhance its bargaining power over against the rest of the world, the result will be international chaos. But if this unity is used to ensure international accord and a large volume of friendly trade between nations, then we can look forward to an era of world peace and international expansion.

Mr. Johnston has already shown that, since his visit to England in the summer of 1943, his understanding of international relations has broadened significantly. His presence on the new committee should now prove reassuring to the British businessmen and give them reason to expect an improvement in our attitude toward postwar economic cooperation with them.

Mr. Johnston tells us that he likes to "talk Spokane." That is his way of saying that he prefers the plain straight-shooting brand of talk. It seems that the Soviet people and their leaders share his liking for plain talk, and together they had no difficulty "talking Spokane." We hope that Mr. Johnston will continue to "talk Spokane" on the many important questions of the day; for then he is of necessity "talking Teheran" as well.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL CONVENTION, C.P.A.

WOMEN

AMERICAN women are making splendid contributions to the war efforts of the United Nations. As members of auxiliaries to all branches of the armed forces, and as nurses, they demonstrate exemplary devotion and courage. As workers in industries and on farms they help to send a constant stream of essential supplies to far-flung battle lines and for the European invasion under way. As housewives they cooperate in rationing, price control and salvage; women volunteer in civilian defense, and in Red Cross and hospital work; they donate blood, buy War Bonds, and collect relief funds and clothing for war-torn areas.

American women realize today that "Fascism is the most deadly foe of women." The cruel suffering of children and the aged, the deaths of millions of helpless civilians, the horrible degradation of women by the Nazis, cry out for vengeance. Support on the home front of the supreme military efforts of the United Nations to crush the Nazi menace to world civilization will help guarantee economic security and enduring peace for future generations. It is necessary resolutely to combat all forms of eleventh hour defeatist propaganda calculated to destroy morale among women, especially wives and mothers of soldiers, a shameful unscrupulous exploitation of their natural anxiety about their loved ones. It is necessary to increase enlistments in the auxiliary armed forces and as nurses, which are inadequate today, and to counteract slander-campaigns calculated to impair the service of women in the auxiliary armed forces.

It is our nation's sacred debt of honor to provide adequate financial aid for dependents of our fighting men and improved pensions for families of those who gave their lives or were disabled in defense of our country. It is the responsibility of the labor movement to encourage and to assist in organizing wives and mothers of soldiers in defense of their rights and those of all servicemen, especially the opportunity for soldiers to exercise their right to vote in the national elections of 1944.

All political parties are unanimous on one point, that the women voters will be the decisive overwhelming majority in the 1944 elections. To guarantee a full registration of all eligible women voters, white and Negro, especially in the South, and to mobilize them on a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

non-partisan basis to re-elect President Roosevelt, is imperative for the welfare of our country and the world. American women must see this election as a most important home-front job to guarantee victory and the complete extermination of fascism from the face of the earth. This is the major responsibility of all women citizens for 1944.

As American women from the homes enter public life they are increasingly alert to their responsibilities as workers. Approximately three and a half million are organized into trade unions. Their integration into the labor movement is important to protect and advance trade union standards. Adequate training, placement, upgrading; equal pay for equal work; and equitable seniority which takes into account (as with the Negro people) their previous lack of opportunity to establish a rating, are some of the basic shop issues affecting women. In the trade unions consistent efforts are essential to organize all unorganized women workers, to conduct classes; to place women on committees and in posts as organizers, to elect them to offices, etc. Women workers' problems are trade union problems. Their solution can immeasurably strengthen the labor movement.

There are eighteen million women wage earners today. The majority carry a double burden—domestic routine added to a job. Adequate provisions for child care, hot meals at plants, marketing and laundry facilities are their imperative needs in order to reduce overwork, illness and absenteeism, and to safeguard the health of mother and child. The experiences of our allies, Great Britain and the Soviet Union, along all these lines are valuable examples for us to emulate. If we are to guarantee uninterrupted and increasing war work by women (to overcome labor shortages), *child care is a major need today,* and adequate legislation is required at once.

A large number of young married women workers are likely to return to domestic life when the war is over. But after every previous war larger numbers of women remained at work than worked prior to the war—unmarried women, widows, wives of disabled soldiers, women who are self-supporting or supporting aged relatives, etc. Such women workers must be free from the fear of dismissal. The labor movement must guarantee to all women the future perspective of their right to work, to full union membership and to protection against discrimination because of sex or color. This is in harmony with the vast possibilities the Teheran agreement presents—of full employment and an adequate standard of life for all.

FARMERS

1. The American farmer has answered the call of our nation at war with enthusiastic patriotism and energetic effort. Sons of the farming population are serving in all areas of the world-wide battlefront and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in all arms of the service. Millions of farm men and women are working in war production plants. And American farmers in cooperation with and under the leadership of the national Administration have given the country the largest agricultural output in the history of the nation.

However, agriculture, as a vital part of the home front, is called upon to perform still greater services in the national war effort. Every ounce of food that the nation can produce—and more—is needed to feed our Army, the civilian population, and our allies. In this great people's war of national liberation, the need for food continues to increase with the Allied invasion of Europe and as the victorious march of our own armies and those of our allies liberates the enslaved peoples.

2. The full contribution of American farmers to victory and to national unity is threatened by Republican demagogy and partisanship, and by the defeatists and the so-called "farm bloc"—a combination of anti-victory, anti-Administration and anti-farm forces. The "farm bloc" is an unholy alliance of Hoover Republicans and Southern Bourbons. It is a camouflage hiding selfish non-farm interests, including certain food processing, meat packing and dairy industry interests. It is being used by the Republican high command for reactionary partisan purposes. It opposes the national endeavor for maximum production and economic stabilization and instead attempts to force upon the nation a policy of scarcity and inflation. The interest of the farmer and of the nation requires a farm economy of abundance with capacity production. The "farm bloc" would not only restrict the contribution of American agriculture to victory, but would also inflict upon the farmers a return to enforced scarcity, unprotected farm income, foreclosures, and agricultural ruin.

The attempt by reactionaries and defeatists to turn American farmers against American workers and other groups in the nation is a stab in the back of our armed forces at the launching of the invasion of Europe and menaces speedy victory, the prospect for any lasting peace, security, and full production after the war. The demagogic misuse by reactionary as well as by liberal or progressive elements of the anti-monopoly slogan among the farmers plays into the hands of the defeatist forces. Unity of farmers, workers, industry and government must be the answer of all patriots to the agents and dupes of the Hitlerites who are now making a desperate attempt to save Nazism-fascism by inciting to disunity and disruption within and among the United Nations.

3. A war-torn, devastated and hungry world needs all the food we can produce for war and post-war needs, for relief, and for rehabilitation. This demand for food is not temporary. Continuous post-war full production is the official policy of our government. It is the official policy adopted by the United Nations Food Conference. The fulfillment of the Moscow and Teheran agreements will enable our country to carry out a policy of interna-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional accord in respect to agricultural production, prices and marketing and is therefore an effective national responsibility for sound economy in agriculture. Thus, new and promising perspectives are open for our whole national economy including agriculture. A world-wide basis for friendly trade between nations, assuring ready markets needed for a large volume of home production and for mutually beneficial exchange—a firm economic foundation for a lasting peace—is the perspective opened to America and to the world in the Teheran Declaration "that our nations shall work together in the war and in the peace that will follow."

4. A united America joined in firm alliance with the American-Soviet-British coalition, and subordinating everything to the winning of the war, is necessary for the full realization of the Teheran perspective. Teamwork and cooperation on the part of all groups in our nation, among themselves and with the Roosevelt Administration in support of the government's victory program, are essential. This means, among other things, bringing the unorganized farmers into the major farm organizations, unifying farmers of all organizations on win-the-war measures, and further developing working unity between the farmers and other patriotic groups, particularly labor.

Such unity will make it possible to promote the security and welfare of the American people as outlined by President Roosevelt in the proposed Second Bill of Rights. These rights can and should be achieved for American agriculture; the right to a decent living for themselves and their families; the right to produce the abundance which our great agricultural resources and scientific knowledge can yield; the right to sell their products at fair, stable prices, free from fear of inflationary booms followed by deflationary busts; and the right to security on the land for the farmers, sharecroppers and tenants.

This means united farm support of the Administration's price stabilization program, which includes effective government-supported price floors for the farmers as producers and price ceilings for the farmers and all others as consumers. This means full support of subsidies, production credit loans, Farm Security Administration, crop insurance, and the war food production programs of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the War Food Administration. It means the fullest cooperation of the farmers with labor, industry, and government in meeting farm manpower needs and in support of the Administration's farm labor mobilization program and of the farm training and placement system of the United States Employment Service. It means full support for a federal land resettlement program for returning veterans. It means the fullest participation of the farm population in the national effort to secure the enactment of vitally needed war legislation, such as an equitable tax program; health, employment, and social security measures; reconversion measures which point toward continuous, post-war full produc-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion; and legislation which extends democracy and removes oppressive, discriminatory practices, such as the poll tax. It means special attention to the need for expanding Federal aid to Southern sharecroppers and tenant farmers, Negro and white.

5. The future of the American farmer is an integral part of the future of our nation and of the United Nations coalition. In 1944 the American people must elect a President and a Congress that will steer a resolute course for the full achievement of the Teheran perspectives of national and international cooperation for speedy victory and for a lasting peace, with approximate full production and employment and improved living standards. Therefore it is incumbent upon the farmers of our land to join with all other win-the-war forces, from workers and soldiers to business men, in non-partisan patriotic election campaigns to ensure the continuation of President Roosevelt's leadership and the election of a coalition Congress, representative of the entire camp of national unity, and pledged to the complete military destruction of fascism, to security and a stable peace.

THE SOUTH

(Submitted by the delegates from Virginia, North and South Carolina, and endorsed by the National Convention.)

We, Southern Communists, delegates to our National Convention, are deeply proud of the magnificent war record of the Southern States. Our youth is helping man the ships, planes, tanks and guns with which America's armed forces, together with those of the other United Nations, are smashing Hitlerism and the Axis.

Southern labor and industry from the shipyards, mines and mills of Virginia to the oil fields and airplane and chemical plants of Texas are producing vital materials for victory. Our farms, fields and ranches are supplying great stores of food and other war essentials.

The South has become a vital area of war production and manpower. This war has shown more clearly than ever before that the South occupies a key place in American political, economic and social life.

In the crucial 1944 elections the majority of the people and the electorate of the thirteen Southern states support the foreign policy and war program of the Roosevelt Administration and are backing the President for a fourth term.

Growing industrialization and the advance of the progressive labor movement below the Mason and Dixon line, and the increased unity of Negro and white, of worker, farmer and businessman, are reinvigorating the political life of the South.

Not only labor and the farmer, but many Southern industrialists as well, are rallying in support of the President's policies. This is stimulating new democratic currents, as evidenced in the re-nomination of Senators Pepper and Hill, the defeat

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Starnes, the withdrawal of Dies' Congressional candidacy, and increasing Negro participation in primaries.

But the war contributions of the South are being achieved under the heavy handicap of an unrepresentative ruling minority, based upon Northern as well as Southern reactionary vested interests. This unrepresentative minority in the South is still able to retard democratic advance and social and economic progress in the Southern states and hence in the country as a whole. Through the system of poll tax "white supremacy" and the one party, minority rule system, the Southern Bourbons are also able to exercise a disproportionate influence on the Congress and on the conduct of national affairs. For this purpose they have formed an unholy alliance with obstructionist and defeatist Republicans.

We believe that patriotic Americans, Southerners and Northerners, increasingly realize that the reactionary Southern Bourbons are a cancerous growth within the nation. The needs of the war and the democratic developments in the South press for the immediate solution of the problem of the old political backwardness, the residue of slavery, that hampers the life of the Southern states. This requires, among other things, the advancement and full integration of the Negro people in the life of the South on the basis of equality.

The "peculiar" institutions of the South, reflecting vestiges of the old slave relationships, are a costly burden in the task of forging a united nation for victory. Bourbon rule in the South, maintained in flagrant disregard for the democratic aspirations of the Southern people themselves, provides a reactionary vantage point from which the pro-fascists conduct Hitler's political warfare within and against our country.

It is not only we of the South who suffer from discriminatory wage scales and semi-feudal plantation relations. Such practices serve not only to lower and retard the economic and social standards of the Southern people, but also jeopardize the welfare of all Americans. For, by restricting the purchasing and productive power of the South, as well as its democratic life, the Poll Taxers shackle the country's economy in its entirety and subvert our democratic processes.

National unity for victory and a lasting peace demands that the South be completely integrated in the national economy and participate fully in the nation's post-war efforts to expand our economy and improve our national well-being. The rights and liberties of the people of the South must be safeguarded and promoted. Toward this end it is necessary to organize and establish unity of action of all win-the-war forces, especially of labor, farmers, liberals and the Negro people in the South and throughout the nation, in securing the adoption of such measures as—

(a) Federal action under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Constitutional Amendments to achieve the extension of the right and practice of voting to the entire adult population.

(b) Guarantee of freedom of ac-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tivity to the trade unions and all other labor and progressive organizations, including the right to organize and bargain collectively.

(c) Abolition of the poll tax and the Jim Crow system.

(d) Enforcement of the recent Supreme Court decision regarding the rights of Negroes to participate freely in all Southern primaries and elections.

(e) Termination of the seniority system governing committee appointments and advancement in Congress.

(f) Establishment of equal pay for equal work in all Southern industries, irrespective of race, age or sex, equivalent to prevailing rates in the North.

(g) Termination of all freight rate differentials, operating against the South.

(h) Expansion of Federal aid to all sharecroppers and tenant farmers; extension of T.V.A. and the rural electrification system and provision of adequate governmental assistance to all farmers desirous of converting existing one-crop agricultural areas and enterprises to the production of new and diversified crops.

(i) Liberalization and extension of the system of Federal social insurance, health and educational aid to all Southerners regardless of color or occupation.

(j) Establishment of an adequate Federal fund providing for long-term credits at low interest rates for the building and extension of new branches of private industry, agricultural undertakings, slum clearance and necessary public works.

These and similar measures are required to rehabilitate and reconstruct the South on a prosperous and democratic basis. These steps are equally necessary to strengthen the national war effort, to construct a sound post-war economy, and to protect and extend American democracy. Around this immediate program of action all labor and progressive organizations, all patriotic Americans, regardless of race, class or political affiliation, should unite their ranks and pool their common endeavors.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION UNITY

The achievement of international labor unity will help establish basic guarantees that the democratic nations will remain united to win the war, to establish a durable peace and to build a better world. Just as American labor is the backbone of our national unity and war effort, so the organized workers of the anti-Hitler countries must provide a firm foundation for the United Nations. World labor unity is indispensable for the full application of the decisions of Teheran, for hastening victory and for establishing a just and durable peace.

Division in the ranks of world labor aided the forces of Munichism in blocking united action by the democratic nations to stop Hitler Germany and the Axis before the entire world was engulfed in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war. This division played into the hands of the anti-Soviet forces in the United States who long prevented our country from achieving with the Soviet Union those common policies that would have brought these two great nations together and strengthened and aided the whole position of other freedom-loving peoples.

At long last international labor unity is on the order of the day. This was shown by the response of the trade unions throughout the world to call for the London conference. The stand of American labor, as expressed by the C.I.O. and Railroad Brotherhoods, as well as by many bodies of the A. F. of L., was an important factor in causing the British Unions to call this world labor conference. The opposition of a handful of A. F. of L. leaders who have long disrupted and paralyzed the ranks of world labor by objecting to the participation of the C.I.O. and the Soviet trade unions in a united international trade union movement, cannot stem the advance of unity of action of world labor. However, American labor is still confronted with the necessity of isolating and defeating the reactionary policies of Hutcheson, Woll, Dubinsky, and Lewis, which still threaten the unity of the American and world labor movements.

Military expediency has prevented the convening of the world conference in London on the date scheduled. By urging that the conference should convene in the Western Hemisphere, American labor will help assure that the postponement will not be used by the enemies of the United Nations to sabotage and undermine labor's unity. The convening of the conference in the Western Hemisphere can be hastened if the membership of the A. F. of L. will actively insist that their great organization take its proper place with the C.I.O. and railroad unions in the councils of world labor. It is to the best interests of the trade unions throughout the country to let their voices be heard on this vital question, and to establish direct contacts with the unions of their trades and industries in Great Britain and the U.S.S.R.

American labor has the special responsibility of establishing the closest ties with the great trade unions of the Soviet Union as a solid basis for uniting all labor on a world scale. Likewise the workers of this country have the responsibility of promoting the closest possible collaboration with the labor movement of Latin America in order to help fully implement the Good Neighbor policy and assure that the United States will be consistently a Good Neighbor to our sister nations throughout the American hemisphere.

When the full strength of American labor is joined with that of its brothers of Britain, the Soviet Union, and the other democratic countries, there will be a great added assurance that victory will be won more speedily, that the coalition of the United Nations will endure, that democracy everywhere will be re-enforced, that powerful unions will be established in the liberated countries; that the forces making for an enduring peace, for prosperity and freedom for all peoples, will be strengthened.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Books on American History

THE STRUGGLE FOR AMERICAN FREEDOM:
THE FIRST TWO HUNDRED YEARS

By Herbert M. Morais

Beginning with the English background of American history, this new study traces the settlement and development of the thirteen colonies, the growth of agriculture, commerce and industry, the rise of democratic institutions, the impact of mercantilism, the organization of colonial resistance and the successful fight for independence, ending with the triumph of the democratic forces under Jefferson.

Price $2.25

THE RISE OF THE AMERICAN NATION 1793-1824

By Francis Franklin

Interpreting the main events in the national development of the United States during its early history, this book covers the period from the establishment of the Federal Government in 1789 to the end of Monroe's second administration in 1825. It describes the democratic victory over Federalist reaction led by Jefferson and the national victory over foreign aggression in the War of 1812, concluding with an evaluation of the emergence in 1824 of new party formations reflecting the new economic groupings.

Price $2.00

"BUILDERS OF THE NATION" LIBRARY

Edited by Dr. Philip Foner

Abraham Lincoln: Selections From His Writings
Thomas Jefferson: Selections From His Writings
George Washington: Selections From His Writings

Cloth $.85, Paper $.25

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT THEY SAY ABOUT—

TEHERAN

Our Path in War and Peace

By Earl Browder

Hartford (Conn.) *Times:* "If someone other than the General Secretary of the U.S. Communist Party had written this book, it might well have had more effect on thinking in this country than it is likely to have. . . . Mr. Browder argues with a great deal of force that we either must accept unconditionally the program expressed at Teheran and make it effective, or 'return to Munich.' *Teheran* is an able book, written with obvious conviction and honesty."

Norfolk (Va.) *Ledger-Dispatch:* "When Earl Browder and Eric Johnston speak the same language, come to the same conclusions, it is time for capital and labor to listen with all four ears. . . . Earl Browder may be a communist and the devil may quote scripture, but he should be given credit for sincerity and what he writes is good sound sense."

Fort Wayne (Ind.) *Journal-Gazette:* "We accepted our review copy as an opportunity to learn at first hand something about Mr. Browder's own ideas instead of what other people think he thinks. . . . The book has been read from cover to cover—carefully, we believe—and we find ourselves in agreement with every one of his main points. . . . Clear thinking, moderation, true patriotism and vision characterize this small volume that furnishes an excellent foundation for a better understanding of the problems that confront America. It merits wide attention."

125,000 Copies Sold to Date!

Cloth $1.50, Paper $.35

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED